

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1848.

No. III.

ART. I.—*An Appeal in behalf of the views of the eternal world and state, and the doctrines of faith and life, held by the body of Christians who believe that a new church is signified (in the Revelation, chapter XXI.) by the New Jerusalem, embracing answers to all principal objections.* By the Rev. S. Noble, minister of the New-Jerusalem church, Hatton Garden, London.

ON the 29th of January A. D. 1689, according to himself, but in 1688 according to others, there was born at Stockholm in Sweden a man, who is known to the world by the name of Emanuel Swedenborg. He was the son of a Bishop in Sweden, was himself a good scholar, made considerable attainments in science, rose to the order of nobles in the kingdom, travelled extensively over Europe, exhibited amiable dispositions, was kindly treated by his monarch, Charles XII., wrote voluminously, and at last died in the city of London in the year 1772, aged either 82 or 83 years and 2 months. During the earlier parts of his life he made some important contributions to science and the arts; but that which has given him the most notoriety, was

the peculiarity of his views on the subject of religion. In 1743, when he was 54 or 55 years of age, he relinquished other pursuits, and devoted himself to teaching and propagating his new doctrines. He made a few disciples in several places, among whom were some persons holding eminent stations; but it is not thought to be interesting or instructive to enter into a history of his sect. The number of his followers at this time is not exactly known to us; but we have seen no evidence that it is large.

In the United States the number is inconsiderable. His disciples are popularly called Swedenborgians; but they designate themselves in their associated capacity as the "New Church," or the "New Jerusalem." According to the minutes of their "General Convention" for 1844, they have 6 ordaining ministers, 18 pastors and teaching ministers, 2 ordained ministers and 5 licensed ministers, in all 31 ministers; of whom, however, 6 do not constantly and regularly officiate. Thus their effective preaching force appears to be 25. From the same minutes we learn that they have the following "Societies," or churches: In Maine 3, in Massachusetts 8, in Rhode Island 1, in New York 6, in Pennsylvania 7, in Maryland 2, in the District of Columbia 1, in Virginia 2, in Ohio 14, in Illinois 2, in South Carolina 1, and in Missouri 1: in all 48.

Of the numerical strength of these societies we have no means of certainly knowing, but suppose it not to be great. Nearly or quite all the houses appropriated to their meetings, so far as we have observed, are small. We have often heard that the number in attendance was generally less than their houses would accommodate. This fact may, however, mislead us; for we believe the members are not generally very zealous in attending their meetings.

The pecuniary statistics of the body would not indicate large numbers or great zeal. At the meeting of the General Convention in 1844, the Treasurer received for all purposes the sum of \$161 83 cents; about one half of which went to pay for the publication of their Journal, \$20 to the fund for educating ministers, and \$50 for the publication of books. These statistics are supposed to be interesting to our readers, and are given here, because we suppose that very few of our readers have access to them in their general reading. Such being the state of

facts, some may ask, why do we notice so small a body, or its publications? We reply: 1st. We have not previously noticed it and we wish to keep our readers advised of such things. 2. Considerable zeal has of late been manifested in some quarters in disseminating the tenets of the "New Church," especially by the circulation of books and tracts; and it is probable still greater efforts may be made for the same purpose during the next few years. According to a quotation found in the North American Review for January 1821, p. 96, Swedenborg stated that the year 1852 is to be decisive of the destiny of the New Church. If his doctrine be not then extensively embraced, it is to be accounted false. Hence, probably, the zeal of his followers is rather greater now than formerly. It behooves them indeed to be up and doing because, counting exactly, less than four of the eighty years, within which it was to make extensive conquests, remain for the great work. If not influenced by this prediction, his followers have of late bestirred themselves; especially in a private way, and some of our readers may need warning. To despise the day of small things may lead us as much astray from our duty concerning evil things as good things. The neglected spark may lead to flames that will consume a city.

We must, however, premise that we have no idea of attempting to tell our readers all or half that is involved in Swedenborg's views. No man can read his writings and those of his followers without thinking of Chaos, described by Ovid as *rudis indigestaque moles*. We do not remember in our lives to have seen so many incoherent, strange and wild opinions brought together. We do not, like one of our countrymen, profess to have read the whole of Swedenborg's works. *Twenty-seven* pretty large volumes of such writings far transcend our powers of endurance, although we are not esteemed by our intimate friends very impatient of labour, if any reward is to follow. Yet we have in possession and have read a pretty respectable shelf of books written by the Swedish Baron and his followers, and we have found in them enough to enable us to make up our minds as to the bearing of the New Church doctrines on some important points.

Before we had read for ourselves, we often heard Swedenborgianism spoken of as a sublimation of Christianity, as a refinement of doctrine and ethics, harmless at least to many. Again

we heard it spoken of as an innocent kind of romancing concerning the spiritual world and a future state. This language did not satisfy our minds. It even alarmed us. For "what is the chaff to the wheat"? Yet until we read for ourselves we had no conception of the extent of Swedenborg's assaults upon fundamental truths and principles.

Our readers will perhaps be much surprised at hearing that Swedenborg and his followers reject from the canon of Scripture a large number of the books received by the Christian world as divinely inspired. This is their language: "The books of the Word are all those, which have the internal sense, but those, which have not the internal sense, are not the Word. The books of the Word in the Old Testament are the five books of Moses, the book of Joshua, the book of Judges, the two books of Samuel, the books of Kings, the Psalms of David, the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; and in the New Testament, the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Apocalypse. Total, Thirty-four books, which complete the canon of the Sacred Scripture or Word of God."* Indeed we believe the Baron's followers, so far as they are informed of his doctrine, universally embrace his views of the Sacred Canon. We have indeed known some of them to deny that such were his views, and voluntarily pledge themselves to renounce his teachings, if such could be shown to be his doctrine. The evidence has been given. They could not deny it. But they still held fast their delusions.

The list above given excludes from the Old Testament the book of Ruth, the two books of Chronicles, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, in all ten. And it excludes from the New Testament the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and every Epistle, in all twenty-two. Total rejected from both Testaments, *thirty-two*. Total received from both Testaments, *thirty-four*. Pretty sweeping work this, our readers will say. We think so too. It is in our view just like Mr. Jefferson's plan of treating the New Testament. He tells us that he selected those things, which he

*See "Arcana Coelestia," n. 10, 325, "New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine," n. 266, and "White Horse," n. 16, and "Hindmarsh's Seal," n. 136.

discovered to be the genuine teachings of Christ and rejected all the rest. How much he rejected we are not told, but we can hardly suppose he rejected a larger proportion of what he attempted to expurgate, than has the Swedish Baron from the whole Bible. We may be thankful that he has left us any of the New Testament. He has rejected *twenty-two* out of its *twenty-seven* books.

The reasons assigned for thus rejecting so large a part of Scripture, are sufficiently curious. One is that these books have not the "internal sense." Whatever may be the meaning assigned to such a phrase, we think it would be very difficult so to define it as by the definition to include the Lamentations of Jeremiah and exclude Solomon's Song. If the former has an internal sense, surely the latter has also. The authority of Swedenborg, capriciously exercised, is the true cause of rejecting these books. The above reason has no application. But Hindmarsh is very bold, and attempts to found the rejection upon the authority of Christ himself. He quotes Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27, and 44, as follows: "Then said he unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. . . . And he said unto them, these are the words which I spoke unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." On this passage he says: "It is remarkable, that our Lord, in this passage, has designated or given us a key to discover those books of the Old Testament as well as of the New, which alone ought to be regarded as *canonical* or of *divine authority* in the church, because written under the *immediate influence* and dictation of the spirit of JEHOVAH, or the LORD, and in their inmost sense treating of HIM alone. The *Law of Moses* denotes all the historical parts of the Word; the *Prophets*, all the prophetic parts, and the *Psalms* may fairly be supposed to include not only that portion of the Word, which is so named, but likewise all those other parts which bear the form and spirit of prayers, praises, thanksgivings and celebrations of the Lord. This rule, therefore, which so well applies to the Old Testament, may also

be applied to the New; and by it we are enabled to distinguish those books, which are absolutely *divine to the very letter* from those, which, though excellent in their kind, are yet only the productions of good and pious men." pp. 309 and 310. Seal. Our object is rather to give a view of what Swedenborgianism is than to refute any of its fancies. Every scholar knows that by the terms, "*Law, Prophets and Psalms*," every Jew in the days of our Saviour understood every book of the Old Testament, as now contained in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, or our English version of the Old Testament. Any work on the canon will make this sufficiently plain even to the common reader. As to the assertion that Christ is found in the "inmost sense" of the book of Judges, and not in that of the book of Job, that he is found in the books of Kings, and not in the books of Chronicles, any reader must see that the application of the rule is purely capricious. As to the attempt to apply the rule to the book of Acts and the Epistles of the New Testament, we can but say its folly is hardly exceeded by its impiety. The Epistle to the Hebrews is almost throughout a treatise on the priesthood of Christ. That to the Colossians sets out with a formal defence of his divinity, and all the rejected books of the New Testament have ever been precious to the pious. Yet they stood in the way of some doctrine of the Baron, and they must be rejected. The truth is, this rejection of *thirty-two* books is an open and arbitrary act of infidelity; and no reason can be given why we may not upon like grounds renounce the whole word of God. We are therefore constrained to admit that Swedenborgianism is strongly tinctured with the spirit of infidelity. This spirit is not the less insidious or dangerous, perhaps, because those, who follow the Baron, make a show of respect to some portions of the word of God, bearing no higher evidence of inspiration than other parts, which they reject.

Some may ask, do not Swedenborgians in their writings quote these very books, whose canonical authority they reject? We answer, they do. A common reader taking one of their books, and seeing Paul's and Peter's and John's and James' Epistles quoted, would be ready to deny that they reject them. In their writings they quote the rejected books, whenever it suits their purposes. The very book under review has in the title-page two such texts, viz: 2 Peter, i: 16. "For we have not followed

cunningly devised fables," and Acts xiii: 40, 41. "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets, Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work, which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." But Hindmarsh explains the reason why they thus quote the rejected books. He says: "Here and there indeed we may give a quotation from, or reference to, the books excepted from the divine code. But then it will be only by way of confirmation of the doctrine advanced, for the sake of those who know not as yet the distinction between those books, which proceed *from the Lord*, and those which proceed *from man*, even from a good and pious man." Seal note to preface, p. 8.

It is as much an act of infidelity to add to the word of God, as to take from it. The theological writings of Swedenborg claim, not to be conjectures, nor philosophical reasonings, nor uninspired interpretations, but to be revelations, and in one sense of a higher order than the writings of the prophets themselves. Thus Swedenborg in his letter to Dr. Hartley quoted in Barrett's Life of Swedenborg, pp. 33 and 34 says: "I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most graciously manifested himself in person to me his servant in the year 1743; when he opened my sight to the view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels." "From that time I began to print and publish various *arcana*; as respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word; with many other more important matters conducive to salvation and true wisdom."

In like manner he declares in "The True Christian Religion," chapter 14, "that this second coming of our Lord is effected by the instrumentality of a man, before whom he has manifested himself in person, and whom he has filled with his spirit, to teach from him the doctrines of the New Church by means of the Word."

Again: "Since the Lord cannot manifest himself in person (to the world,) and yet he has foretold that he would come and establish a New Church, which is the New Jerusalem, it follows that he will effect this by the instrumentality of a man, who is able not only to receive the doctrines of the church in his

understanding, but also to make them known by the press. That the Lord manifested himself before me his servant, that he sent me on this office, and afterwards opened the sight of my spirit, and so let me into the spiritual world, permitting me to see the heavens and the hells, and also to converse with angels and spirits, and this continually for many years, I attest in truth; and further, that from the first day of my call to this office, I have never received anything appertaining to the doctrine of that church from any angel, but from the Lord alone, whilst I was reading the Word. To the end that the Lord might be constantly present, he revealed to me the spiritual sense of the Word, in which sense Divine truth is in its light, and in this light he is continually present." pp. 516, 517.

His biographer claims for him that he understood all he wrote, but that the prophets did not understand what they wrote. Thus we suppose he intends to prefer him before them in the matter of inspiration.

In a tract busily circulated by Swedenborgians, entitled "A few plain answers to the question, why do you receive the testimony of Swedenborg?" the 12th chapter has this caption in italics: "I receive the testimony of Swedenborg, because he is presented to the world in the honourable and highly distinguished character of a Seer, as well as an expositor of the Sacred Scriptures, and because, in that character, he has been enabled to communicate information of the highest importance to the happiness and well being of mankind." There is no doubt, therefore, that his followers do claim for him the very highest character, that a servant of God could have. Practically they put his writings before those of the prophets. They do "take Swedenborg's disclosures as the standard of every thing," which bears a relation to the unseen world.

Swedenborgians also deny the doctrine of the Trinity as understood and received in the Christian world. Swedenborg says in so many words "that the whole system of theology in the Christian world at this day is founded on an idea of three Gods arising from the doctrine of a trinity of persons." See Brief Exposition of the doctrine, &c., by Swedenborg. In his work on the Athanasian Creed he endeavours to show that the doctrine, which has its name from Athanasius, "leaves a clear idea whilst it is reading, that there are three persons, and hence that

there are three unanimous Gods, and an obscure idea that God is one, and so obscure, that it does not remove the idea of three Gods."

So also Barrett, in his lectures on the doctrine of the New Jerusalem church, Lecture 8, pp. 255, 256, says "Now it is repeatedly affirmed in the revelations made for the New Jerusalem church, that this great central doctrine of religion—doctrine concerning the Lord—as taught at the present day in the catechisms, creeds, commentaries, confessions of faith, and from the pulpits of the Old Church, is not *true* but *false*. Consequently the sun of that church has become darkened; a thing, which, according to the Lord's prophetic announcement in the Evangelists, was to take place at the Consummation of the Age. (See Matt. xxiv. 29; Mark xiii. 24.) It is also alleged in these revelations, that, because this fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, as taught in the prevailing church, is false, therefore the doctrine of the atonement, of regeneration, and indeed all the doctrines of the Old Church which grow out of this concerning the Lord, and which depend upon it as their foundation, are likewise false. For it is well known that a solid and enduring superstructure can be reared only on a solid foundation; and if the central truth of any system of doctrines be wrong, all the subordinate and derivative truths must necessarily be not *truths* but *false*s; and consequently the whole system must also be wrong." He afterwards says, "It may be shown still more clearly that those who really believe in a trinity of *persons* in the Godhead do actually believe in three Gods." p. 259. Noble also in section 7, attempts to show that Tritheism is the alternative of what he calls the true doctrine. And yet Swedenborgians reject the doctrine commonly called Unitarian. Hindmarsh calls his work a "seal upon the lips of Unitarians, Trinitarians, and all others who refuse to acknowledge the sole, supreme, and exclusive divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Yet Swedenborg in his Brief Exposition, p. 21, says "that there is a divine Trinity is manifest from the Lord's words, Matt. xxviii. 19." After all this our readers will perhaps be surprised to find the London General Conference in the use of language familiar to the New Church declaring in the first article of their faith that there is in God "the divine Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which are the essential divinity, divine human-

ity, and divine proceeding, answering to the soul, the body, and the operative energy in man; and that the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is that God."*

Our readers will naturally enquire is not this a revival of the doctrine of Sabellius. We answer that to a certain extent it certainly is. Sabellius and Swedenborg both maintained, that there is but one person in the Godhead, that that one person was the maker of all things, that he became incarnate, and, that exerting his influence, he was called the Spirit. There is indeed considerable variation in the language used, but the substance seems to us to be the same. Swedenborgians seem to feel the difficulty arising from this quarter. Accordingly Noble in his appendix endeavours to show that the New Church doctrine of the Trinity is not a revival of Sabellianism, or any other ancient heresy. He also contends that with all its errors the doctrine of Noetus is greatly superior to that of Tripersonalism.

We have strenuously endeavoured to understand the Swedenborgian doctrine concerning the Trinity. In brief it seems to be this, that Jesus Christ is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already stated that it is not our main object to refute Swedenborgianism, but to give a view of it. Our readers will therefore not expect in this place a defence of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Swedenborgians also deny that Jesus Christ in his own person bore any punishment for us, or made any satisfaction to divine justice on behalf of sinners. We have already quoted from Barrett's Lectures, where he pronounces "the doctrine of the Atonement false." Thus also Noble in his appeal pp. 438, 439, 440 and 444, speaks. Having quoted Rom. v. 11, he says "It is not a little extraordinary, that a word (atonement) which occurs but once in the whole of the New Testament, from which, more especially, Christians profess to derive their creed, should have come to occupy so great a space in the language of the theology of the day. And it is more extraordinary still, that it should have come to be supposed, that the Lord made an atonement to the Father." Yet he admits that "the atonement is reconciliation with God, including the means by which reconciliation is effected." He also declares "our doctrines never teach that we

* See Sketch of Swedenborg and Swedenborgianism, p. 14.

may not view Christ as a sacrifice for sin; but they show on the contrary how he truly was such." He then undertakes to show "that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment of sin;" "and that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sin, but that his sacrifice consisted in the hallowing of every principle or element of his Human Nature to the Godhead, till at length his whole Human Nature became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated, sanctified, and hallowed, by perfect union with his Divinity."

Swedenborg in his tract on Faith p. 17, says, "The Christian faith, in its universal idea, is this: That the Lord from eternity, who is Jehovah, came into the world to subdue the hells, and to glorify his Humanity; that without this no mortal could be saved; and that they are saved who believe in him." So also in his "doctrine of the New Jerusalem concerning the Lord," Swedenborg has an entire chapter to show that "the Lord by the passion of the cross did not take away sins." He subsequently says that "by taking away sins, the like is meant, as by redeeming man and saving him." Nay, he says more, that "any one may see from reason alone, if he be in any illumination, that sins cannot be taken away from man, except by actual repentance, which is, that a man sees his sins, implores the help of the Lord, and desists from them. To see, believe, and teach otherwise is not from the Word, nor is it from sound reason but from lust, and a depraved will, which constitute man's *proprium*, by which intelligence is debased into folly." pp. 29, 33, 34. Our readers will by this time perceive why Swedenborgians reject the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of the New Testament. Doctrines more contrary to those taught by the Apostles we may safely say have never been propagated.

Swedenborgians also deny the doctrine of justification by faith, as it is generally received in the Christian world. Thus Swedenborg says in the "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 571, that the doctrine of faith alone, that is, faith without the works of the law, justifies and saves, is not from the word, but from a single expression of Paul misunderstood, Rom. iii. 28. So also in his work on "Divine Providence," n. 115, says: "They who are of faith separate from charity, and have confirmed themselves from the saying of Paul to the Romans, *that man is justified by faith without the works of the law*, iii. 28, adore this saying as

those who adore the sun, and become like those, who fix their eyes earnestly on the sun, from which the sight becoming blunted does not see anything in the midst of light; for they do not see what is there understood by the works of the law, that they are the rituals which were described by Moses in his books."

This is not the first instance in which the doctrine of justification by faith alone, has been greatly misrepresented. The Christian world does not hold that the faith, which justifies, is separate from charity, or that it alone exists in the heart, but the doctrine is, that that faith which works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world is the grace and the only grace that so lays hold of Christ as to obtain an interest in his redemption. Faith is not meritorious but only instrumental in justification. If Swedenborg had half the information or discernment attributed to him by his followers, he must have known that he was misrepresenting the doctrine of the Christian world. At the same time it is evident that he is utterly averse to the doctrine of justification by faith as held by the Protestant world. In his "Brief Exposition of Doctrine," n. 109, he says, "The imputation of the righteousness or merits of Christ, enters at this day, like a soul into the whole system of the reformed Christian world; it is from imputation that faith, which is therein accounted the only medium of salvation, is affirmed to be righteousness before God; and it is from imputation that man by means of that faith, is said to be clothed with the gifts of righteousness, as a king when elected is invested with the insignia of royalty. But, nevertheless, imputation, from the mere assertion that a man is righteous, effects nothing, for it passes only into the ears, and does not operate in man unless the imputation of righteousness be also the application of righteousness by its being communicated and so induced." And in n. 114, of the same work, having described a spell of sickness which he had, he says, he "heard shocking speeches such as the following. . . . Whilst we are saved freely without any merit of our own, what need is there of anything but only the faith, that God the Father sent the Son to take away the curse of the law, to impute his merit to us, and so to justify us in his sight, and absolve us from our sins, and then to give the Holy Spirit to operate all good in us?" If such doctrine be "shocking" to Swedenborgians, Christians cannot be at a loss to know what to think of the "New Church" doctrines. There lies before us a little Sweden-

borgian tract called the "The Golden Wedding Ring." It is written by the Rev. J. Clowes, a minister in the established Church of England, who seems to have embraced Swedenborg's views. On the last two pages is a prayer for the married couple, in which there is not any allusion to the merits of Christ, or redemption by his blood. But we have this. "We have pledged ourselves at thine altar, to love, comfort, honour, and keep each other in sickness and in health. Enable us then to recollect that if we are negligent in the discharge of these duties, we are offenders against thee, to whom we have pledged ourselves for the performance of them; but if we conscientiously fulfil them, we then secure thy favour, and draw down upon our heads thine eternal blessing." We suppose that works are the ground on which Swedenborgians generally expect the divine blessing. Swedenborg himself, in the "Brief Exposition of Doctrine, &c." n. 108, says, "that the first reason why the Roman Catholics may be brought into the New Jerusalem, or New Church, more easily than the Reformed is, because the faith of justification by the imputation of the merit of Christ, which is an erroneous faith, and cannot be together with the faith of the New Church, (see n. 102 to 104,) is with them obliterated, and is like to be more fully so; whereas it is as it were engraven upon the Reformed, inasmuch as it is the principal tenet of their Church."

After these declarations, our readers cannot be at a loss to determine what is the tendency of the New Church doctrines. If justification is "the article of a standing or falling church," as Luther said, and as Swedenborgians admit, then the Protestant world must give up its most cherished and clearly established principles on justification by faith, or it must reject the doctrines of the New Jerusalem.

Swedenborgians, as we have already seen, deny the doctrine of Regeneration, as understood in evangelical churches and pronounce it "false." It would make this paper too long to go into a minute consideration of their views on this subject. We simply state that they utterly reject the evangelical doctrine, although they write much about what they call regeneration.

Swedenborgians also deny the doctrine of the resurrection of the body of Jesus Christ, or of any of his saints, or of any human being. Thus in the tract already quoted, entitled "A Sketch," &c., p. 16, article 11th, declares, "that immediately

after death, which is only a putting off of the material body, never to be resumed, man rises again in a spiritual or substantial body, in which he continues to live to eternity; in heaven, if his ruling affections, and thence his life, have been good; and in hell, if his ruling affections, and thence his life, have been evil." Barrett in his lectures says, pp. 335 and 336, Lect. x: "The spirit of man, after the death of the body, appears in the spiritual world in a human form, altogether as in the world; he enjoys also the faculty of seeing, of hearing, of speaking, of feeling, as in the world; and he is endowed with every faculty of thinking, of willing, and of acting as in the world. In a word, he is a man as to all things and every particular, except that he is not encompassed with that gross body, which he had in the world; he leaves that when he dies, nor does he ever re-assume it."

"This continuation of life is what is understood by the resurrection."

It is also said in the *Arcana Coelestia*, n. 5078, by Emanuel Swedenborg, that "man rises immediately after death, and then appears to himself in the body altogether as in the world, with such a face, with such members, arms, hands, feet, breast, belly, loins; yea, also when he sees himself and touches himself, he saith that he is a man as in the world; nevertheless it is not his external principle, which he carried about in the world, that he sees and touches, but it is the internal principle, which constitutes that very human principle, which lives, and which had an external principle about it, or out of singular the things belonging to itself, whereby it could be in the world," &c., &c. Noble also goes into this subject at great length in the work under review. From p. 35 to p. 119, he defends the New Church doctrines on the resurrection. We cannot forbear here to quote the words of Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 16, 17, 18. "Shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as a canker; of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." So also he says, Rom. i. 4, that Jesus Christ was "declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." In 1 Cor. xv. 12, 22, the apostle has argued at length and with much earnestness, that his preaching and the faith of his hearers were alike vain, "if Christ

be not risen." In Heb. vi., Paul puts the doctrine of the "resurrection of the dead" as lying at the "foundation" of "the principles of the doctrine of Christ." Without quoting more texts we simply refer our readers to the texts found under the word resurrection in any good concordance. It is true indeed that Swedenborgians hold a doctrine, which they call, the doctrine of the resurrection. But it is not a resurrection at all. It is, as we have already seen, not a reviving or rising of the dead, but, as Barrett calls it, a "continuation of life." That is, they do not hold to annihilation at death; but that the soul will exist after it shall be separated from this body, and will always have a substantial or spiritual body. They do not hold that any, much less "all that are in their graves shall come forth." John v. 28, 29.

Swedenborgians also deny the doctrine of future and final judgment. They hold that the last judgment took place ninety one years ago, that is, "that the last judgment spoken of in the New Testament, was effected by the Lord in the spiritual world, in the year 1757; it being a judgment upon those in the world of spirits, who had been of the former church; the good were then elevated to heaven and the evil cast down to hell." Edinburgh Encyclopædia, Art. Swedenborg. In his Appeal, Noble lays down and argues at great length this proposition, "That the general judgment announced in the scripture, as to be performed at the second coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world, as commonly supposed, but in the spiritual." This proposition he puts in italics. He supports it by attempting to prove, 1st, that there is no such thing as the resurrection of the body taught in scripture. 2nd, that a personal coming of the Lord in the clouds is a thing impossible, and 3d, that the world will not be consumed. Section 4, part 4, has this caption: "The last judgment actually accomplished." In corroboration of his view that the judgment is past, he gives in a note from a friend various improvements in arts, science, &c., touching such matters as the "Linnean system of natural history," "the steam engine," "the true nature of thunder and lightning," &c. &c. Near the conclusion of the section he says: "What change could there be adequate to the production of so great a change as we are witnessing here, but the performance of the last judgment? . . . The illustrious Swedenborg, so long ago as the

year 1758, declared, (in his work on the Last Judgment) that, by the last judgment, then just accomplished, spiritual liberty was restored, and the state of servitude and captivity, in which men's minds were previously held, in regard to spiritual subjects, was removed." We have turned to Swedenborg's work on the last judgment, and there we find him maintaining, "that the procreations of the human race on the earth will never cease," and assigning many whimsical reasons for his belief. He also asserts "that all the things, which are predicted in the apocalypse, are at this day fulfilled," "that the last judgment has been accomplished," "that this last judgment was commenced in the beginning of the year 1757, and was fully accomplished at the end of that year," n. 6, 40, 45. The evidence of the assertion, that the last judgment is past is given thus: "It has been granted me to see with my own eyes that the last judgment is now accomplished;" "it was granted me to see from beginning to end how the last judgment was accomplished;" "it was granted me to see all these things with my own eyes"—very strong, and satisfactory proof, no doubt, to a man who has already determined to believe whatever the Baron may say. The same work and its "Continuation," abound with vagaries of the very wildest nature. We give one of many as a specimen. Speaking of the world of spirits, which is mediate between heaven and hell, and of members of the Reformed Churches, who have died, he says they are "arrayed according to countries. In the centre of this middle region are the English; towards the South and East of it are the Dutch; towards the North, the Germans; towards the West and North, the Swedes, and towards the West, the Danes."

Perhaps the most pervading principle of Swedenborgianism is what is called the Science of Correspondence. With the Baron and his followers, every thing in scripture is figurative. Thus a horse signifies the understanding, a chariot signifies doctrine, land signifies church, an earthquake signifies a change of the church, Adam signifies "the most ancient church, or all the men who belonged to that church, or the genuine principles of faith and love," and "all proper names of scripture denote universal principles of the mind, which proceed from the Lord." Barrett says: "Inasmuch as man was created an image and likeness of God, therefore every thing in the natural world must also represent by correspondence some spiritual principle appertaining to

the mind of man." p. 191. In illustration of this doctrine, he quotes from Swedenborg as follows, (Barrett pp. 192, 193)—

"No one can know what is the quality of the life of the beasts of the earth, of the birds of heaven, and the fishes of the sea, unless it be known what their soul is, and the quality thereof; that every animal hath a soul is a well known thing, for they live, and life is a soul, wherefore also in the word they are called living souls. That the soul in its ultimate form, which is corporeal, such as appeareth before the sight, is the animal, cannot be better known from any other source, than from the spiritual world; for in the spiritual world in like manner as in the natural world, there are seen beasts of all kinds, and birds of all kinds, and fishes of all kinds, and so like in form, that they cannot be distinguished from those which are in our world; but the difference is, that in the spiritual world they exist apparently from the affections of angels and spirits, so that *they are appearances of affections*, wherefore they also vanish away as soon as the angel or spirit departeth, or his affection ceaseth; hence it is evident that their soul is nothing else (but some human affection); consequently that there exist as many genera and species of animals, as there are genera and species of affections." (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1199.)

"Inasmuch as the universal heaven is distinguished into societies, in like manner the universal hell, and also the universal world of spirits, and the societies are arranged according to the genera and species of affections, and inasmuch as the animals there are appearances of affections, as was just said above, therefore one kind of animal with its species appears in one society, and another in another, and all kinds of animals with their species in the whole together. In the societies of heaven appear the tame and clean animals, in the societies of hell the savage and unclean beasts, and in the world of spirits beasts of a mediate character. They have often been seen by me, and it has been given thereby to know the quality of the angels and spirits there; for all in the spiritual world are known from the appearances which are near and about them, and their affections from various things, and also from animals. In the heavens I have seen lambs, sheep, she-goats, so similar to those seen in the world that there is no difference; also turtle-doves, pigeons, birds of paradise, and several others of a beautiful form and colour; I have seen like-

wise various kinds of fish in the waters, but these in the lowest parts of heaven. But in the hells are seen dogs, wolves, foxes, tigers, swine, mice, and several other kinds of savage and unclean beasts, besides venomous serpents of many species, likewise crows, owls, and bats." (Ibid. n. 1200.)

On this principle of correspondence the scriptures are made to mean any thing that the fancy of man can invent. Thus notwithstanding Christ says that in heaven they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God, the truth is that there are many marriages in heaven, and that the angels themselves are married. The whole of n. 40 of Swedenborg's work on "Conjugal Love" is in these words, "CONSEQUENTLY THAT THERE ARE MARRIAGES IN HEAVEN. This, being now confirmed by reason, and at the same time by experience, needs no further demonstration." The "experience" here referred to, has been recorded in previous parts of his works, where he tells of having been at some splendid marriages in heaven.

Lest the patience of our readers should be exhausted we will not weary them with further lengthened details. We will notice only a few more and that very briefly. Swedenborg in the *Arcana* says: "Eating the flesh of animals, considered in itself, is somewhat profane," yet he concludes that "no one is by any means condemned for this, that he eats flesh," n. 1002; quoted in his life, p. 139. His disciples hold that they have intercourse with spirits. With some of them it is customary to have plates set at their tables for some departed one. Swedenborg is said to have had all the apostles to dine with him, as he averred. Another notion of Swedenborgians is that the next world will be like this. Thus he said: "In the world of spirits I have not seen any one so splendidly served and waited on as the deceased empress Elizabeth of Russia," and that Frederick V. and "all the kings of the house of Aldenburg were very well off." Life of Swedenborg, pp. 133, 134, General Tuxen's Letter. In Swedenborg's work, entitled "the earths in our solar system," p. 28, n. 39, we have the following: "On a time I saw that spirits of our earth were with spirits of the earth Mercury, and I heard them discoursing together, and the spirits of our earth, amongst other things, asked them, on whom they believed? They replied, that they believed on God; but when they inquired further concerning the God on whom they believed,

they would give no answer, it being customary with them not to answer questions directly. Then the spirits from the earth Mercury, in their turn, asked the spirits from our earth, on whom they believed? They said, that they believed on the Lord God; the spirits of Mercury then said, that they perceived that they believed on no God, and that they had contracted a habit of professing with the mouth that they believe, when yet they do not believe; (the spirits of Mercury have exquisite perception, in consequence of their continually exploring, by means of perception, what others know): the spirits of our earth were of the number of those, who in the world had made profession of faith agreeable to the doctrine of the church, but still had not lived the life of faith, and they who do not live the life of faith, in another life have not faith, because it is not in the man. On hearing this, they were silent, inasmuch as, by a perception then given them, they acknowledged that it was so."

The question naturally arises, by what kind and amount of evidence mankind are called on to believe these crude, contradictory and absurd opinions? It seems the question was asked in the life-time of Swedenborg. Mr. Ottinger, superintendent of the mines in Sweden, wrote to him, and in 1766 received from Swedenborg the following reply: "To your interrogation. Whether there is occasion for any sign that I am sent by the Lord to do what I do? I answer, that this day no signs or miracles will be given, because they compel only an external belief, but do not convince the internal. What did the miracles avail in Egypt, or among the Jewish nation, who nevertheless crucified the Lord? So, if the Lord was to appear now in the sky, attended with angels and trumpets, it would have no other effect than it had then. See Luke xvi. 29, 30, 31. The sign given at this day, will be an illustration, and thence a knowledge and reception of the truths of the New Church; some speaking illustration of certain persons may likewise take place; this works more effectually than miracles; yet one token may perhaps still be given."

One cannot fail to be struck with the points of agreement between Mohammed and Swedenborg as teachers. As men indeed their characters were very different. As to the means of propagating their doctrines, they were very different. But as to the evidence, on which they ask us to receive their professed revela-

tion, there is very little difference in principle. Mohammed no less than Swedenborg admitted the inspiration of Moses and the authority of the Pentateuch, and of the prophetic writings; and also acknowledged the divine mission of Christ, and the truth of the Christian scriptures.

Mohammed claimed to be commissioned to purify these former dispensations from their corruptions, and as the last and greatest prophet, to communicate divine instruction to mankind. Swedenborg professed to be instructed from heaven to exalt what was low in our conceptions of the Jewish and Christian religion, and to unfold that which, though comprising their most valuable contents, was before unknown. Both think rather meanly of the miracles of Moses and of Christ. The Mohammedan accounts the Koran itself as a perpetual miracle, and the greatest of miracles; the Swedenborgian esteems the inspiration discovered in the writings of his prophet, and the intercourse which he held with the spiritual world, too dignified to be placed in competition, with the greatest miracles that were ever wrought. The remarks made by Mr. White, in his Bampton Lectures, concerning Mohammed's representations of another life, apply with no material variation to Swedenborg's account of the spiritual world. "He (Mohammed) generally descends to an unnecessary minuteness and peculiarity in his representations of another life, which excite disgust and ridicule, instead of reverence; and even his most animated descriptions of the joys of paradise, or the torments of hell, however strong and glowing the colours in which they are painted, are yet far inferior in point of true sublimity, and far less calculated to promote the interests of piety by raising the hopes and alarming the fears of rational beings, than that degree of obscurity, in which the future life of the gospel is still involved, and those more general terms in which its promises and threatenings are proposed to mankind."

We shall conclude this notice by some general observations.

One is that the writings of Swedenborg and his followers constitute a labyrinth, the like of which we have never before attempted to thread. To the fanciful, who allow their imaginations full scope, the system offers boundless fields. Should the writings now in use be found insufficient, every man's wildest roving of mind can supply the defect. But to the sober-minded who wish evidence before faith, who exercise their judgments,

and are governed by any laws of reasoning, or rules of interpretation, we can conceive of nothing more unpleasant than an attempt to read, digest or understand the doctrine. We have called it above "a system," but we used the term for want of a better. It is a maze, a howling wilderness, a dreary waste of confusion and impiety.

Some of Swedenborg's writings are worse than wild. The tendency of all of them as we think is to relax the bonds of moral obligation. But some of them sunder every bond of purity, and introduce the wanton and lewd to the paradise of the vile. We do not choose to defile our pages with extracts. But we have never seen or heard of any work more likely to familiarize the mind with the lowest forms of vice than one of Swedenborg's. Those who have read his writings, know to which work we refer. Those who do not know, would not have their useful knowledge increased by our telling them.

The recent attempts to propagate Swedenborgian doctrines in some parts of our country have been anything but candid and fair. Indeed in reading the books and tracts sent out by the New Church, hardly anything has struck us more forcibly than the attempt to inveigle and deceive the unwary. Especially is this true of the smaller publications. They contain the less exceptionable opinions of Swedenborg and his followers, and are circulated with great industry in order to prepare the way for other things, which will come in due time. We are not surprised at this. Paul and Christ and the prophets long since told us that guile would mark the course of errorists. It has ever been so. It will be so to the end of the world. The world has never yet seen and will never see a zealous propagator of dangerous doctrines, who has been or shall be candid and fair and open in his avowals.

Some may ask whether we suppose these doctrines will be widely spread. We answer that we suppose not. *Twenty-seven* volumes of considerable size are likely to deter most readers. Some, no doubt, will take the doctrines as found in small tracts. There is little in these doctrines offensive to the pride or lust of the natural mind. But there is so much incoherence, wildness and extravagance in all of Swedenborg's own writings that we cannot suppose the masses of men will do more than read a little, wonder perhaps, or perhaps smile, lay down the book, and

say that if they turn their attention to religion at all, they at least desire that it should have some sobriety. Dr. Wood of Andover, has done a good service in publishing the letters of a maniac in a Lunatic Asylum, and thus letting the reader judge whether the maniac or Swedenborg had least sobriety of mind.

Our readers will ere this have gathered that we do not regard the New Church doctrines as innocent or inoffensive. Unless they have read a considerable portion of Swedenborg's works, they can have but a faint idea of their denunciations of the whole Christian world. In his "Brief Exposition" p. 53, n. 87, Swedenborg holds, "that they who have confirmed themselves in the present justifying faith" [that is the reformed churches which hold justification by faith] "are meant in the apocalypse by the Dragon, and his two Beasts, and by the Locusts; and that this same faith, when confirmed, is there meant by the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where the two witnesses were slain, as also by the pit of the abyss, whence the locusts come forth." In n. 91, he maintains that unless a New Church be established by the Lord, no one can be saved. In other words Swedenborgianism is essential to salvation. Let the friends of truth not fear to oppose this bold and impudent error.

As to the mode of treating this delusion, one text of Scripture seems to meet the whole case. Moses says: "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spoke unto thee, saying, let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; then thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: For the Lord your God proveth you whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him and cleave unto him." Deut. xiii. 1, 4.

ART. II.—*An Apology for the True Christian Divinity: being an explanation and vindication of the principles and doctrines of the people called Quakers.* By Robert Barclay. London. 1765: pp. 574.

THE system of doctrine which George Fox erected, and to which his followers so tenaciously adhere, is one of singular compactness, and is quite as complicated. To one who has never examined the system as a whole, this may seem strange, inasmuch as the working of their ecclesiastical organization is one of apparent simplicity and smoothness. It has fallen to our lot to be compelled to examine this system with careful attention, and we record it as our deliberate, and well grounded opinion that it is one of peculiar closeness and of remarkable intricacy, and that it contains within itself the germs of an evil which if fully developed would tend to sap the foundations of Christianity, and to spread over all the Society of Friends the blight of a withering infidelity. In reviewing one of the leading principles of the Friends, we disclaim at the outset any attack or imputation upon their character for piety, and upon their worth as a religious society. We count it among our peculiar privileges to number among our best and most estimable acquaintances, many who are members of the Society of Friends; and while it would be to us a source of regret if any of these should have their feelings unnecessarily wounded, we should prove unfaithful to them and to the interests of true religion did we fail on that account to point out what we deem a very grievous error in their system of faith, and a gross perversion of the sacred scriptures. It would require a volume, rather than an article, did we undertake to review all the principles of the Friends. We content ourselves with noticing at length the one article of their faith which we have placed at the head of this Review.

The doctrine of the "Inward Light," is at the foundation of the system which George Fox succeeded in rearing. He taught as the great primary principle of the faith, that there is a "light" within every man sufficient to guide him into the way of life; that this light is placed there by God for that very end; that if it be followed, it will lead every one in the right path; and that if it be not followed, his destruction will be inevitable. Whatever importance he might attach to other doctrines, this was to

him all important. If other doctrines were neglected, this at least was adhered to with tenacity. These are the terms in which he gives expression to his views. "The Lord opened to me by His invisible power, how every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ."¹ "Wicked men were enlightened by this light, else how could they hate it."² In his letter to the princess Elizabeth, he uses the following expressions. "For the Lord is come to teach His people Himself, and to set up his ensign, that the nations may flow unto it. There hath been an apostacy since the apostles' days, from the divine light of Christ, which should have given them the 'light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus;' and from the Holy Spirit which would have lead them into all truth; and therefore have people set up so many leaders without them to give them knowledge."³ "This was the word of faith the apostles preached; which is now received and preached again, and is the duty of all true Christians to receive. So now the people are coming out of the apostacy to the light of Christ and His spirit, to receive from Him and not from men."⁴ In his reply to Howitt, he says, "Thou art not only anti-Christ, but anti-apostle, that is, against Him, who taught people to look to the light within them, and told them that the light shined in their hearts. to give them the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Christ Jesus."⁵ "By the light within all is discovered and made manifest, for it is the light within that discovers a man's thoughts, and the counsels of man's heart; and Christ within is light."⁶ All the writings of Fox abound with language of a similar stamp.

William Penn, in his preface to Fox's journal, uses the following language: "They were directed to the light of Jesus Christ within them, as the seed and leaven of the kingdom of God; near all, because in all, and God's talent to all. A faithful and true witness, and just monitor in every bosom. The gift and grace of God to life and salvation, that appears to all, though few regard it."⁷ And to show that we have not placed an undue estimate on its importance in the system, Penn says, "I have already touched upon this fundamental principle, *which is as*

¹ Fox's Journal, p. 72.² Ibid. p. 379.³ Ibid. p. 504.⁴ Ibid. p. 505.⁵ Fox's Works, Vol. III., p. 459.⁶ Fox's Works, p. 459.⁷ p. ix.

the corner stone of their fabric; (the italics are ours,) and to speak eminently and properly, their characteristic, or main distinguishing point, or principle, viz: the light of Christ within, as God's gift for man's salvation."¹

This fundamental doctrine of the religious system of the Friends, is very briefly this: every man in the world has a sufficient guide to the knowledge of his duty, without the aid of any external means; that his guide is Christ, indwelling in all men, who is the true light that lightened every man that cometh into the world; that if he obey this light, and follow wherever it shall lead him, he will arrive at perfection; that if he do not obey it he will go to destruction. This is the doctrine of the inward light as started by Fox. His statements are often contradictory, and very much perplexed; but this is the doctrine as gathered from his writings, and confirmed by the teaching of his followers. Among the crowd of disciples who have echoed the sentiments of Fox, none occupies a higher place than Robert Barclay, whose Apology for the doctrine of Friends has been pronounced by the Yearly meeting held in Philadelphia, in 1843, to be authoritative.² His language upon this subject is clear and plain. "God hath given to every man, whether Jew or Gentile, Turk or Scythian, Indian or Barbarian, &c., . . . a certain day or time of visitation; during which day or time, it is possible for them to be saved." "For this end God hath communicated and given unto every man, a measure of the light of His own Son, a measure of grace, or a measure of the Spirit," &c. "God. in and by this light and seed, invites, calls, exhorts, and strives with every man in order to save him; which, as it is received and not resisted, works the salvation of all, even of those who are ignorant of the death and sufferings of Christ, and of Adam's fall,—both by bringing them to a sense of their own misery, and to be sharers in the sufferings of Christ inwardly, and by making them partakers of His resurrection, in becoming holy, pure, and righteous, and recovered out of their sins. By which also are saved, they that have the knowledge of Christ outwardly, in

¹ p. xi.

² "The principles and testimonies of our religious Society set forth in the writings of our early Friends, particularly in the "Apology for the True Christian Divinity," written by Robert Barclay,—a work with which we have divers times declared our unity."—Preface to Ancient Testimony, 1843.

that it opens their understanding, rightly to use and apply the things delivered in the scriptures, and to receive the saving use of them."¹ "In regard Christ is in all men as in a seed, yea, and that he never is nor can be separate from that holy, pure seed and light which is in all men; therefore may it be said in a larger sense that He is in all."² "As we truly affirm that God willeth no man to perish, and therefore hath given to all, grace sufficient for salvation, so we do not deny but that in a special manner, He worketh in some, in whom grace so prevaleth, that they necessarily obtain salvation, neither doth God suffer them to resist."³ "Those that have the Gospel and Christ outwardly preached unto them, are not saved but by the working of the grace and light in their own hearts."⁴ "By the working and operation of this, many have been, and some may be saved, to whom the gospel hath never been outwardly preached, and who are utterly ignorant of the outward history of Christ."⁵

Gurney calls this doctrine "an important doctrine of religion," and says that "it is promulgated among the Friends with a peculiar degree of earnestness," and that it "lies at the root of all their peculiar views and practices."⁶ Concerning this "important doctrine," this is his testimony: "Now with Friends, (and I believe with very many persons not so denominated,) it is a leading principle in religion, a principle on which they deem it to be in a particular manner their duty to insist, that the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul are not only immediate and direct, but perceptible, and that we are all furnished with an inward Guide or Monitor, who makes His voice known to us, and who, if faithfully obeyed, and closely followed, will infallibly conduct us into true virtue and happiness, because He leads us into a real conformity with the will of God."⁷ "When the pride of the heart is laid low, when the activity of human reasoning is quieted, when the soul is reduced to a state of silent subjection in the presence of its creator, then is this 'Still, small voice' intelligibly heard, and the word of the Lord as it is inwardly revealed to us, becomes 'a lamp' unto our 'feet,' and a 'light' unto our 'paths.'"⁸

It is not necessary to increase the number of witnesses, since there is a general agreement among the standard writers of

¹ Barclay's Apology, pp. 132, 133.

³ Barclay's Apology, p. 151.

⁶ Gurney's Observations, p. 36.

⁴ Ibid. p. 174.

⁷ Ibid. p. 38.

² Ibid. p. 143.

⁵ Ibid. pp. 174, 5.

⁸ Ibid. p. 47.

Friends upon this doctrine. We proceed therefore to examine the doctrine as taught by those already quoted, first presenting the scriptures on which it is grounded. The following are the principal passages; viz. "That was the true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world."¹ "Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace."² "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh."³ "The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."⁴ "But what saith it, the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is the word of faith which we preach."⁵ "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men."⁶ "I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people."⁷ "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."⁸ "Which was preached to every creature under Heaven."⁹ "Whom we preach warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."¹⁰ "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."¹¹ "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." "Who gave Himself a ransom for all."¹² "All things that are reprov'd, are made manifest by the light, for whatsoever doth make manifest is light."¹³ "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."¹⁴ "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal."¹⁵

These are some of the passages on which this doctrine of Friends is founded. In order to examine them more carefully, they may be divided into three classes, viz.: Those which assert Christ to be the Saviour and Light of all mankind; those which speak of Him as willing to receive all men; and those which directly oppose the doctrine they are brought to support.

It has always been a leading principle of the Christian church, that our Lord and Saviour tasted death for every man: and that by his death a way has been provided, by which all men may be saved. George Fox thought this a discovery of his. He was grievously mistaken. Upon this point the church has never held or taught another doctrine. There is in every man, a

¹ John i. 8. ² Ibid, i. 16. ³ Gen. vi. 3. ⁴ Deut. xxx. 14. ⁵ Rom. x. 8.

⁶ Titus ii. 11. ⁷ Luke ii. 10. ⁸ Mark xvi. 15. ⁹ Col. i. 23. ¹⁰ Ibid, i. 28.

¹¹ Matt. xi. 28. ¹² 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6. ¹³ Eph. v. 13. ¹⁴ Rom. x. 17.

¹⁵ 1 Corinth. xii. 7.

principle implanted by God, by which each man can determine the correctness of certain actions, and which signifies its approval or disapproval of those actions. This principle, called "conscience," acts according to the light it has, and was not meant to determine upon evidence which it has not. It is sufficient to lead the heathen to determine that certain acts are sinful.¹ It is not sufficient to lead them to trust in a Saviour of whom they have never heard.² It approved Saul's conduct in persecuting what he believed was opposed to the church of God. It condemned this act when he has greater light by which to judge. This natural conscience, we have reason to believe, is implanted in every person born into the world, who has the use of his reasoning faculties. The "Friends" assert that this conscience is not the "light" of which they speak. Their doctrine is that Jesus Christ so dwells in every man, that every man has but to look within his breast, and listen to, and obey the voice of Christ, and he will be led in the way of life and never go materially astray. Now, the Bible every where teaches that Jesus Christ died to save men from eternal death; and that faith in this Saviour is the instrument by which they appropriate His merits to themselves. It further teaches that faith in Jesus is impossible if they have never heard of Him; and that when faith is wanting, except in those who are incapable through mental imbecility of its exercise, the curse of everlasting death will descend upon the soul. It speaks in strong terms of the approving and reproofing power of conscience; but it does not allude, in a single instance, to any possibility of following Christ by obeying its dictates. The Friends have, therefore, drawn a distinction between the natural conscience, and what they term the indwelling of Christ within the heart of every man; a distinction, which is so far just, in that conscience is, and Christ is not in every man; but which we hope to be able to show in the course of the argument rests upon an essential fallacy. We hope to be able to show that the natural conscience is the light of which they speak; that there is no other light given to mankind in general save the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Scriptures reveal no way by which the Saviour can be known to men by any internal communication. The language of St. John in the first chapter

¹ Rom. ii. 15.² Ibid, x. 14.

of his gospel, upon which Fox and his followers have built their scheme of doctrine, evidently means that Christ is the "Light" to the world at large, and not to the Jews alone. A careful examination of the original, renders it equally clear that the words "cometh into the world," can as well refer to the "Light" who was to enlighten every man, as to those who were to be enlightened; so that the passage might as well read, "That was the true light, which, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man." This interpretation moreover, is sustained by other passages in which the phrase "coming" or "cometh into the world" is applied to Christ, as a mark of distinction, as in John vi. 14: "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world." Of course this makes no essential difference, if the remaining words retain their present interpretation. But the word translated "enlighteneth," would be more correctly rendered "is to enlighten;" while the words "every man" if interpreted by a similar phrase in the apostolical commission, will make the whole passage mean that Christ, coming into the world, came to enlighten every nation, and all of every nation by his doctrine. We give this rendering, in order to show that the passage cannot be quoted, with propriety, to sustain the doctrine in question. But, if we receive the present as a correct translation, it will not bear the interpretation which Friends put upon it, and is opposed by facts. In the first place if every man has Christ within him to direct him aright, whenever any obey the light within, he must of course be right. The Mohammedan obeys the only light he has within him, when spreading his religion by fire and sword. The cannibal obeys his light when he sacrifices his victim and eats him. In the second place, no one has ever heard of a Mohammedan or a cannibal who was made a follower of Christ by the light within him; a very strong presumptive evidence, we should think, that there is a glaring error in this part of the system of Friends, and that their interpretation of this passage is wrong.

Another favourite passage is that in Titus ii. 11: "The grace of God that bringeth salvation has appeared to all men, &c.," of which it is unnecessary to say more than that St. Paul asserts that the gospel had appeared to *all classes of men*, servants as well as masters, and that no one before George Fox supposed it to refer to any thing else, than that Christ died to save men

of all classes, the masters no more than the servants. There is not a shadow of evidence that it refers to a "light" within every man's breast.

Perhaps the passage that appears most strongly to favour this doctrine of Friends, is that contained in the Epistle to the Romans, ii. 14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the works of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another." We have so often heard this passage referred to by Friends, that we have concluded it to be one of their strongest proofs. Properly understood, however, it has no bearing on the subject. The apostle is not there treating of the way of salvation; he does not say that the Gentiles do by nature all that the laws require, and thus secure salvation by obeying the inward light, or dictates of conscience. This would be in direct contradiction to his previous assertions and to his whole design. His grand object is to show that neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither those enjoying a written revelation, nor those living under the light of nature, can be saved by their own works, or in any other way than through the redemption by Christ. This he proves, by demonstrating, in the first place, that all men are sinners, and if sinners, justly condemned or guilty before God. And then to show the Jews that their case is not an exempt one, that they are not to be saved on the ground of being God's chosen people, he shows that God is just and impartial; that he will render to every man according to his works, to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles; and that he will judge them according to the light they have severally enjoyed. The Jews shall be judged by their scriptures; the Gentiles by the law written on their hearts. Neither class could stand this test; but the whole world judged by any righteous standard was guilty before God.

It is in this course of reasoning the passage referred to occurs. Paul had said, those that sin without law shall perish without law, and those who sin under the law shall be judged by the law. This however supposes that the Gentiles, who have "no law," i. e. no external written divine rule of conduct, are a law unto themselves, or that they have a law written on their hearts to which they are amenable. To prove this he refers to two facts. First,

they do the things of the law; they perform moral actions, which evince a moral sense. Secondly, their conscience approves or disapproves of their conduct. Wherever there are moral acts, and the operations of conscience, there is law. It need not be externally revealed, but it is no less authoritative, being written on the heart. He therefore says of the Gentiles; they know the righteous judgment of God, that they who do such things, are worthy of death. If our own heart condemn us, God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things. The doctrine of this passage therefore is any thing but the doctrine of the "Inward Light" of Friends.

The second class of texts embraces those which express a willingness on the part of Christ to receive all men. Now we may safely ask, who doubts the willingness of Christ to receive all mankind? And having asked it, may safely ask again, who would infer from it that Christ is *in* every man, woman, and child in the world? When he invites us to come to Him, on what solitary passage of scripture is the idea based that he means that we shall turn our thoughts within, and contemplate him as dwelling within us? There is not a particle of evidence from scripture to support any such interpretation. We are directed and invited to go to Christ. We all know that the going is not as we would go to an earthly friend. We cannot thus go to Christ, and it is very certain that multitudes of those who came to Christ when he was upon earth, never accepted the invitation which he addressed to them. We understand, and they understood, the invitation to be, a willing submission of the heart to him; the going forth of the heart in the act and habit of faith upon him. But certainly, before George Fox no one ever supposed that the coming to Christ, was the turning of the heart and mind in upon themselves to survey Christ as dwelling within them.

The third class of texts which we have asserted to be opposed to the doctrine in question, is so strongly opposed to it, that we wonder the more intelligent among the Friends have not seen the folly of attempting to force upon the texts embraced in it, an interpretation so singularly adverse to their meaning. We take these two passages only: "The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest do it." "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is

the word of faith which we preach." The latter quotation is taken by St. Paul from the former, and the context shows that the whole reasoning of the Apostle requires it to be explained by the passage in Deuteronomy. What then does the Apostle say of "the inward light?" Nothing at all. He expressly says, the word that was nigh them even in their mouth and heart, was "the word of faith which we preach." And what word was that? was it that there is a light within, which alone man was to follow, in order to attain to heaven? Far from it. "That, if thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and wilt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For, with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." But now, let us mark the succeeding reasoning of St. Paul, and observe how entirely it is opposed to this theory of Friends. "For the scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel, for Esaias saith, Lord who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." If from this passage the doctrine of the inward light can be drawn by any other process save that of the sponge and the thumb-screw, we have only to say that the deducer must be possessed of a large share of that inspiration to which Fox and his co-workers laid claim. No body else could discern it. The whole reasoning of the Apostle has evident reference to the word as preached, received into the heart by faith, and not to an inward light.

Now, if the interpretation that we have given of the above passages be correct, the theory of Fox respecting an inward light is proved utterly without foundation; and we might well spare ourselves the trouble of replying in detail to Barclay and Gurney's answers to the objections of those who approve their

favourite doctrine. But we cannot leave this subject with the present exposition. Consequences too momentous flow from this doctrine of Friends, to allow of our dropping the discussion here; and we crave the indulgence of our readers while we endeavour to point them out.

The first great error to which this doctrine necessarily leads is *the disparagement of Holy Scripture*. The constant reference to scripture which we have been accustomed to hear, when conversing with friends, deceived us into the belief that they paid the most implicit deference to its teachings. But we have long since found ourselves mistaken. We have been shocked to read such sentiments as we have found in their standard writers in reference to the scriptures, and we are unwilling to believe that the larger portion of the Society of Friends are aware of the actual teaching of their own standards upon this one point. We consider that teaching quite as bad, and even a little worse than that of Rome. She exalts herself into the infallible expositor of holy writ. She believes the inspiration of the scriptures, but requires all who belong to her to receive her teaching as of equal authority with them. The Society of Friends exalts every man, woman and child, into an infallible expositor, and denies to the scriptures what Rome allows them—authority as a rule of faith and practice. Rome does allow them to be a rule, when interpreted by herself. The Friends deny them the nature of a rule at all. As this, however, is a matter of the utmost importance, we are the less willing that our word should be taken for the statements we have here made; accordingly we furnish the authority on which we rest the accusation. Our first authority is George Fox. “At one time came three non-conformist priests and two lawyers to discourse with me; and one of the priests undertook to prove ‘that the scriptures are the only rule of life.’ After I had defeated his proofs, I had a fit opportunity to open to them the right and proper use, service, and excellency, of the scriptures, and also to show that the Spirit of God which was given to every man to profit withal, the grace of God which bringeth salvation; and hath appeared unto all men, and teacheth them that obey it to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world; that this, I say, is the most fit, proper, and universal rule which God

hath given to all mankind, to rule, direct, govern, and order their lives by."¹

Barclay unfolds this view. "We may not call them" (he is speaking of the scriptures,) "the principal fountain of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the first adequate rule of faith and manners, because the principal fountain of truth must be the truth itself; i. e. that whose certainty and authority depends not upon another. . . . The writings and sayings of all men we must bring to the word of God,—I mean the eternal word, and if they agree hereunto we stand there. For this word always proceeded, and doth eternally proceed from God, in and by which the unsearchable wisdom of God, and unsearchable counsel and will conceived in the heart of God, is revealed unto us."² Again, "The very nature of the gospel itself declareth that the *only* and *chief rule* of *Christians*, else there should be no difference betwixt the law and the gospel."³ Once more—"That which is given to *Christians* for a rule and guide must needs be so full that it may clearly and distinctly guide and order them in all things and occurrences that may fall out. But in that there are numberless things with regard to their circumstances, which particular Christians may be concerned in, for which there can be no particular rule had in the scriptures: therefore the scriptures cannot be a rule to them."⁴

Gurney writes as follows,—"The law written in the book, and the law written in the heart, have proceeded from the same author: the only standard of both these laws is the will of God, and the former corresponds with the latter, as the image in the mirror corresponds with its original. It ought, however, to be remarked, that the written law, for the most part, consists in *general directions*. Now the inward manifestations of the Spirit of Christ, while they confirm the principles on which those general directions are founded, will instruct us how to employ them in our daily walk, and under all the various circumstances and exigencies of life. For example, the outward law declares, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The inward law will not only inculcate the same rule, but will point out to the obedient followers of Christ, in what manner and on what occasions this love is to be brought into action.'"⁵

¹ Journal, p. 476.

² Barclay's Apology, p. 71.

³ Ibid, p. 72.

⁴ Barclay's Apology, p. 74.

⁵ Gurney's Observations, p. 55.

He considers the obedience of the scriptures alone as leading to a very imperfect obedience: "How imperfect is the obedience of those persons who acknowledge only the written law, and who in the application of that law to the various incidents and occasions of human life are accustomed to seek no other direction than that of their own reason, and depend upon no other strength than that of their own wills."¹

His conscience seems to have chided him for this disparagement of scripture, and his admission is not a little remarkable that the inward light is subject to the same abuse. He says:

"It may, moreover, be questioned, whether something of the same kind may not be detected in the experience even of seriously-minded Christians, who while their dependence is mainly placed on the grace of God, are not fully believing in the light of Christ, *as it is inwardly revealed in the soul.*"²

William Bayley's reasoning is so choice that we cannot avoid a reference to it. "Now, this—(he is speaking of the 'Word')—was not the scriptures, but of this the scriptures declare, even of the Word which was in the beginning, before the scriptures were written, which cannot properly in any sense be called the Word, or Word of God, because they are many words, and declare of what God did and said, of his creating the world by the Word, which was not created by the scriptures, but holy men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit which is the Word. And said Moses 'God spake all these words,' which God was the Word in the beginning that spake the words, &c. &c."³ "And yet how ignorant have people been since the apostles' day (in the apostacy) of these things, calling the scriptures the word of God, when the scriptures themselves say Christ is the Word, and in the beginning was the Word, and the world was made by the Word. But the scriptures were not in the beginning, neither was the world made by them."⁴

Thomas Evans, in his Exposition, writes thus—"They (the Friends) believed the sensible influences of the Holy Spirit, to be the primary rule of faith and life, and therefore could not, conscientiously, accord this epithet to the scriptures, however excellent in themselves. . . . Friends constantly admitted, and indeed always declared that they were the words of God spo-

¹ Gurney's Observations, p. 56.

³ Bayley's Works, p. 180.

² Ibid, p. 56.

⁴ Ibid, p. 181.

ken by the Holy Ghost through holy men of old ; *a secondary rule subordinate to the Spirit* ; the best and only *outward* standard and test, for determining the soundness of doctrine, and to which they constantly appealed as the authority for the truths they promulgated."¹ William Penn held the same view.² George Whitehead calls the scriptures "a rule subordinate."³ And Benjamin Lindley while acknowledging the scriptures to have been inspired, says that Friends own them "the best secondary and subordinate rule that is extant in the world."⁴

Such are the views of the elder and later Friends upon this important subject. The authors quoted above are all standard among the Friends, and are arranged by Evans in his "Exposition," along with many more, into a register of authoritative expositors. The objection which we have made to these views, that they depreciate the Holy Scriptures, must, we think, be clearly apparent. The moment we deny the authority of scripture, as the great revelation of God to man, a revelation abundantly sufficient to guide him in all his moral history, that moment do we make it to occupy a position altogether subordinate. The Friends it is true, speak of the scriptures as a revelation of God to man, one revelation out of many which God is making to our world, but they speak of it as insufficient from our minute guidance because dealing only in "general directions." Now general directions may sometimes be susceptible of very minute and special application, and if the scripture is not, it is hazarding nothing to say that it is a useless revelation. To give us directions, but to give them so that we cannot follow them ; to tell us what we must do, but to tell us so that we cannot possibly do it ; to undertake our guidance through life ; and yet to say no more, than "you must go right, for if you go wrong you will perish ;" to tell us this, but not to tell us of the difficulties in our way, the comforts we may expect to meet, and the precise way itself, would be but mockery of our condition. If it is not our guide, the guide as God's revealed will to us, we cannot see any end it can serve, particularly when we have a rule within us which will give us the most minute and specific directions. We can very well dispense with "general directions," when assured that we have a rule within us which will guide us with

¹ Evans' Exposition, p. 11. ² Ibid, p. 244. ³ Ibid, p. 250. ⁴ Ibid, p. 280.

unfailing accuracy through paths the most sinuous, and through labyrinths the most intricate. The scriptures in that case would be altogether superfluous. Now the scriptures, it is true, will never tell a man what business in life he must pursue. They will not tell him which of two roads he must take on a journey in order to reach a particular spot. A thousand cases of perplexity will arise in which the Bible will give us no specific directions. And it is absurd to think that it should. A thousand volumes could not contain the directions necessary to meet the cases of any dozen men, if they undertook to give directions for every incident and for every occasion. In truth, each man, in that case, would need a separate Bible expressly for himself, containing every movement of his history, or every contingency that could possibly happen to him carefully mapped down, accompanied with directions for each contingency. It would be a Bible comparatively useless to any one else. But is not the "Inward Light" as useless here as the scriptures? Did no Friend ever lose his way in a journey? Have none of them ever erred in any measure they have undertaken? Have Friends who relied upon its guidance never mistaken their profession? We cannot avoid the thought that ~~this~~ method of riding ones self of the scriptures is either the offspring of infidelity, or a fearful trifling with a solemn subject. Barclay knew, and so do all Friends know, that the Bible was never meant to guide us on such points as we have mentioned¹. God gave us the Bible as the revelation of his will to us respecting our everlasting state. He has prepared it with reference to this end, and in it has given us information concerning our duty in order to attain this end. He has told us, what else we could not have known, that we are under his curse, that he has provided a Saviour to remove the curse, that repentance towards God, and faith in Jesus as a Saviour will appropriate to ourselves individually that redemption, and that holiness of heart and purity of conduct are needed each moment that we live. It gives us minute directions as to our moral conduct, and is entirely sufficient as a directory for it. This, Barclay does not pretend to deny; and it is but silly trifling with a solemn subject, to speak

¹ Yet Barclay objects against the scriptures being our guide, that they do not guide us in these matters. Apology, pp. 74 to 76.

as he does about the insufficiency of scripture as a guide, because it does not give to each man minute directions as to what may be termed his physical conduct, as contradistinguished from his moral. It is certainly sufficient for all that God meant it for; and that was, to guide us to heaven. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works."¹ The apostle here places the scriptures on the highest possible ground, and asserts their entire sufficiency for the end for which they are prepared. "By them" the man of God may be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The original of "instruction" is *παιδείαν*, and is used by classical writers to denote the minute and progressive education of youth. This single passage alone, then is sufficient to overturn the theory of Friends. But the words "thoroughly furnished" in the Greek *ἐξηρτισμενος*, are still more expressive. The primary idea is that of the most perfect fullness, a fullness so complete that nothing more can be added to it, in order that the man of God may be able to perform "every good work." The inward light then can add nothing to the scriptures. They are sufficient of themselves. "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."² Does Paul appear to have had any doubt of their entire sufficiency as a guide to man in his moral conduct? Then mark too the striking testimony of sacred historian of the "Acts of the apostles." "These were more noble than those of Thessalonica. in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so."³ The Bereans were "without God in the world," when the Apostle came among them with the word of eternal life. The inward light, the directions of which are said to be so exceedingly minute that they are able to guide the footsteps of all men in every possible condition of life, had never taught them to go to Jesus Christ for salvation. Yet when Paul and Silas preached to them from the written word, from that word which Friends say contain only "general directions," the Bereans received the word with all readiness of mind, and then searched the scriptures

¹ 2 Timothy iii. 16, 17.² Ibid. iii. 15.³ Acts. xvii. 11.

daily, whether these things were so. Very strange, if the inward light is the guide of men, very strange indeed! But in no wise strange if the scriptures are their guide. The scriptures were the alone test of the truth and doctrines of an inspired apostle; inspired with the highest degree of inspiration known to men. Our blessed Lord never appealed to the inward light. "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."¹ "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me, but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"² "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."³ The scriptures alone were deemed sufficient by our Lord to guide men to heaven. Certainly he never tells them to take heed of an inward light. Peter on the day of Pentecost bid the multitudes repent and be baptised for the remission of sins, and they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptised."⁴ Fox would have told them that they had the light within them, to sit still, say nothing, and the light would open to them their duty. "We have also," says the same apostle, "a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecies of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."⁵ We ask any who have become interested in the examination of this subject, to observe the comparison with which Peter introduces these words. Than what was the "word of prophecy more sure?" The preceding verse says it was the announcement made by God the Father to the apostles that Jesus was "His beloved Son, in whom He was well pleased." The announcement of this fact, in connection with the whole circumstance of the transfiguration. "The more sure word," the apostle says, is that "of prophecy." He does not even allude to any inward light. The words "of prophecy" clearly limit the interpretation to the prophetic scriptures. Is it not strange that Peter makes no allusion here to an "inward light?" Instead of

¹ John v. 39. ² John v. 46. ³ Luke xvi. 31. ⁴ Acts ii. 38, 41. ⁵ 2 Peter i. 19, 21.

doing so, he bids Christians take heed to the scriptures. "No!" Barclay says; "he bids them take heed to them until the day dawn, and the day star arise in their hearts!" He does so. But which is the inward light, the word of prophecy, or the day dawn? If the former, then the latter is not. If the latter, then the scriptures were to be read, and carefully pondered, until that event, whatever it is, should arise. Whatever else that event shall prove to be, there is no authority from the passage in its connection, for interpreting it of the "inward light" of Friends. The whole connection—speaking as it does of prophecy which had served amid the darkness of the world, the purpose of a lamp, to indicate the movements of Providence with regard to redemption—would seem to render that interpretation the correct one, which refers the rising of the day star to the full development of the doctrine of Christ upon the mind and upon the world.

In every instance, to the scriptures, were made the first and last appeal, and in no instance is the inward light alluded to; a fact which affords, we think, a strong presumptive proof that the scriptures are, and the inward light is not, the guide of man to heaven. The scriptures are undoubtedly inspired, and the same Spirit who inspired is needed to enlighten our minds that we may understand the spiritual meaning of the truth expressed; and if by the inward light being our rule no more were meant than that the Holy Spirit, as the author of the scriptures, must enable us to understand them, we readily admit it. But this is a different doctrine from that of Friends. Now is the scriptures our rule or not? If it is, we must use it as such. If it is not, we are at a loss to know where it is revealed that the Spirit is, and how this counsel is to be fallibly known apart from the scriptures? It is to the spiritual meaning of the scriptures, that the Holy Spirit is to guide me. The Friends have yet to prove in the face of the scriptures themselves, that the Spirit, without the written word is the rule of faith.

But the Friends have made the most ample concessions upon this point, and have shown by undoubted evidence, that neither the scripture, nor the inward light, nor both together, constitute their rule of faith. Fox asserted the insufficiency of the scriptures as a rule and he made a rule that was to be sufficient; a rule, which, whoever should follow, could not fail of holiness

here, and heaven hereafter. He told men of a light within that would guide them aright. It was unerring. It had never failed him; it could never fail another. God himself had promised to guide those who should trust to his guidance, and it was impious to question his sufficiency, as they did who questioned the sufficiency of the inward light. The Bible is only paper and ink, a dumb and lifeless volume. The inward witness is ever-living, and, if cherished, will never fail to direct us aright. Every man must share it. It places each man in an independent attitude of every other. He needs no external witness to enable him to understand the truth. The fountain of truth is within. No priesthood, no authorised expounder of holy scripture is wanted. Creeds and confessions and all other human paraphernalia, tend to cloud the light. The poorest and most unlettered man may know as much of every thing as the highest and mightiest intellect. Each man has but to sit down and await the guidance of the Spirit. The light will guide him. The oracle is within; consult it, and it will speak. If you wish to know the way of salvation, you need not consult the scriptures. Consult the oracle enshrined within.¹ Whatever your doubts, whatever your cares, whatever your temptations, consult the oracle. Doctrines known and unknown will be taught you by it. Questions of casuistry will be taught you by it. It will teach you the way to heaven; and it will teach you the precise road to take from Philadelphia to Oregon Territory. We are not straining our subject to make out our point. We are serious. It would be wrong, fearfully wrong to trifle with such a subject. Listen to Barclay,—

“The general rules of scripture, viz: *to be diligent in my duty; to do all for the glory of God, and for the good of His church*, can give me no light on this thing,” (viz whether he should occupy his time in preaching in one place or another, in confirming the faithful, or in some other work.) “Seeing two different things may both have a respect to that way, yet I may commit a great error and offence in doing the one when I am called to the other. If Paul when his face was turned by the Lord, towards Jerusalem, had gone back to Achaia or Macedonia he might have supposed that he could have done God more ac-

¹ Ancient Testimony. p. 43.

ceptable service in preaching and confirming the churches, than in being shut up in prison in Judea; but would God have been pleased herewith? Nay, certainly. . . . What master is so sottish and careless, as having many servants, to leave them in such disorder, as not to assign each his particular station, and not only the general terms of doing that which is profitable? which would leave them in various doubts, and no doubt end in confusion."¹ Of course, if Like Paul our faces are turned towards a particular course of conduct *by the Lord himself*, so that like Paul we must know that it *is* the Lord who guides us, we would have no excuse for error. But this is a pure *petitio principii*. Paul was divinely inspired, and in reference to the particular direction referred to, and some other directions, he was supernaturally guided. We ask for the evidence that we are always thus supernaturally directed in all the affairs and occasions of life? We have already pointed out in this article some of the passages in Barclay, still more plain.² Fox, Penn, Gurney, and the rest, all teach the same thing,—that we must follow the guidance of the *inward light*; that the light is plain in its directions; and that each man is able to ascertain for himself its meaning; and that he must so ascertain it, because no man can decide for his neighbour. It lies beyond the ken of any other man to determine what the light has told us. It may tell us something very different from that it has told any body else; for obviously it may tell us much that it withholds from others; and we are to be the alone judge of its communications. And yet how do their writers illustrate their principle in practice? Robert Barclay with *his* inward light has written an exposition of nearly six hundred pages of the views and principles of Friends; a treatise on Church government; a catechism, and a confession of faith. All for the instruction of a society, whose first principle it is that every person has a light within him sufficient to guide him without such aids. Gurney has written a volume on the religious peculiarities of the Society, consisting of three hundred and eighty pages; and Thomas Evans in a volume of three hundred and twenty-four pages, has given us an exposition of their doctrinal views. And these books are received and acknowledged as authoritative standards, by men, who, discard-

¹ Apology, pp. 75, 76.

² Apology, pp. 74, 297, 298.

ing the Bible profess to take the inward light as their only standard. The views contained in these books, are the views of the Society, to which every one who belongs to it *is obliged to conform*. No liberty is allowed upon these points. They must at least profess to believe what their standards bid them believe. The celebrated schism caused by Elias Hicks proves incontestably that the members of the Society are bound to hold the views contained in these works and that no others will be tolerated. But there is a possibility that the light may teach us something very different from that which it taught Fox, Barclay, Penn, and Gurney; for where is the evidence that it will teach us nothing more? And we must follow the light. No human composition shall claim our faith while the heavenly light is our guide. We do not want the stream while we have the very fountain itself. It is but a contradiction to assert the necessity of an inward light to guide every man; in other words, every man must stand or fall by himself alone, and at the same time bind us down to a confession and a creed, and thus, it may be, obscure the "light" in its first faint glimmer in our hearts. The confession and the creed are their rule of faith, not the light within. The works to which we have referred are the interpreters by which Friends expound both the inward light and the scriptures, and by which they measure out to all their members the precise amount to be believed, in order to salvation. To be consistent, each man should discard all creeds, catechisms, and apologies, shut up the Bible, with its merely "general directions," and, turning his thoughts within himself await with patience the unfoldings of the light that is already there, and which is to give him the minute directions he will need. Those directions he ought to follow, let them lead him where they may. The fact that this is not done; that Friends are obliged to fence themselves round with distinctive badges, and peculiar ecclesiastical views, to which they oblige a conformity, is evidence of their distrust of their own primary principle. The "inward light" then is not their guide. They are obliged to frame their faith, and to trim their "light" by George Fox, and Robert Barclay, who have made it their especial business, to point out what, and how much, each must believe. But in truth, it matters little which is followed, the "inward light" or the standard. In either case the Bible holds a secondary place; and the moment

that we displace the Bible from its true position as *the rule* of faith and practice, making it hold, in any sense, a subordinate position, we enter within the precincts of that fatal territory where infidelity reigns supreme.

Let us, then, enjoy what we think is the "inward light," (and, no matter what the Bible may teach us, that light, as a divine substance within our hearts, must, on the theory of Friends, be paramount to any thing written,) and if that light should lead us to deny the fundamental articles of Christianity—to deny the creed which the church has ever had; and with Elias Hicks to reject the divinity of the Son or the personality of the Holy Ghost, who can presume to charge us with blame? Or who will call us to account for our faith? It would indeed, little matter in that case, what we believed. We would only need to adopt as our own the sentiment of the skeptical poet,

For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.

And if we were the veriest skeptic on earth we should certainly calculate upon reaching Heaven at last, however in the end it might be proved that we were utterly wrong. They might well shudder at this consequence. It makes us tremble while we dwell upon it; and we are persuaded that very many of both sides among the Friends repudiate the consequences of their own positions.

We may be told that Barclay in his second proposition, denies that the light can be contrary to the scriptures or sound reason.

He does so, but unfortunately the denial is neutralized by the very next sentence. "Yet from hence it will not follow that these divine revelations are to be subjected to the examination either of the outward testimony of the scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule and touchstone; for this divine revelation, and inward illumination is that which is evident and clear of itself, forcing by its own evidence and clearness, the well disposed understanding to assent, irresistably moving the same thereunto." We have no wish to force a construction on any man's language, and can readily admit, that supposing the inward light to be greater than the scriptures, or the scriptures to be greater than the light, the two may perfectly harmonize. But here is an insuperable difficulty in our way. If neither the scriptures nor reason are to be admitted as our

tests of the inward motion of the Spirit, and our minds are irresistably impelled to assent" to its suggestions, then, surely, it matters but little what the scriptures may teach; the inward light is one supreme guide on earth, and its revelations are not to be brought to the examination of any test. Even reason is excluded. In other words the scriptures are excluded.

If moreover, the scriptures are not our supreme guide, and if the light is, what hinders that the Mohammedan, the Persian, and the New Zealander may not get to heaven by following the light within? We must believe that the watchful eye of God rests on many an aching bosom, and many a troubled conscience among the heathen unable to find relief. Why does not the light within direct them? Friends say that it does. Does it direct the mother to cast her child to the fire? The father to feed the crocodile with the flesh of his child? Or the guilt-worn conscience of the sinful man to seek relief by torturing his body upon a bed of spikes? And why is it that the scriptures bring home to his bosom, that peace he cannot elsewhere find, and which the inward light had never even held up before him? Plainly this; the scriptures reveal to him One who is mighty to save, who has made a full provision for his salvation; they farther disclose to him in the person of the incarnate Son of God an example that he may with safety follow. This, the inward light can never do; for admitting that there is such a light we must first know the scriptures in order to know that it exists. Fox, it may safely be asserted, would never have dreamed of an inward light, had he not first read in the scriptures, something about a light, which he tortured into a conceit on which his whole system was to rest. And if he could not have known of an inward light except through the scriptures, we may safely deny that the heathen can know aught of the Saviour by the mere teaching of the inward light. Barclay, in a passage already quoted, says they can.¹ It really appears to us to be useless for Barclay to admit the inspiration of the scriptures at all; for if upon his theory (which is of course that of Fox and his whole society,) the light within is sufficient for all men—Jews, Turks, and Infidels—as a guide to Heaven, and as revealing to them Jesus Christ, the scriptures are of course unnecessary. Every man

¹ Apology, pp. 132, 133.

has within him that which is better than paper and ink. And Gurney does not scruple to assert as we have already seen,¹ that the inward light is that lamp and light, which David asserts the scriptures to be. Hence, the conclusion is the more inevitable that the inward light being sufficient, the scriptures are of little worth; and the scriptures being depreciated, will the inward light *infallibly* guide our steps? Alas, no! This system strikes down the Bible from the place that God meant it should occupy, and gives us in its stead a wretched uncertainty, which, it appears by their own confession, we cannot follow without risk of eternal loss. Their writers, admitting as they do, the sufficiency of the light within acknowledge that we may be egregiously mistaken in our ideas of duty while endeavouring to follow the light, and while we think we are following it. Gurney's testimony upon this point is most remarkable.

He says "It is not to be forgotten that the human imagination is very active, and very delusive; and that persons who are superficial in religion, or who are not sufficiently watchful, may sometimes mistake the unauthorized dictates of their own minds for the voice of a divine and unerring guide. . . . It appears therefore, on the one hand, that the inward illumination of the Spirit of God, is mercifully bestowed on us as a perceptible guide to righteousness; and that, on the other hand, we are exceedingly liable to be led about by the dictates of our own imagination."² A very singular predicament the larger part of mankind would be led into by this system if it were generally received. We must learn from the scriptures that an inward light exists within us as our guide to heaven; then, the scriptures—though they may be studied, are of little importance; and when we ask if we can trust ourselves to the guidance of the light; whether the weak as well as the strong in intellect, may find its directions most sure, we are told, that it is very probable, they will not be able to determine between it and the workings of their own imaginations. Can that be the standard of truth by which we may be so easily deceived, as that we may not be able to distinguish it from the workings of our own imaginations? The scriptures are liable to no such uncertainty. They may be

¹ Gurney's Observations, p. 47; Bayley's Works, p. 180, 181.

² Observations, p. 44.

wrested to evil. They may be grossly perverted. But the way of salvation is very distinctly unfolded in them, and the poor man who has a mind to understand anything can learn from them the way to Heaven. Shall we reject *this* unerring guide at the bidding of George Fox, for that which his own followers pronounce upon experience to be so wretchedly delusive? They have displaced the scriptures as the standard of faith and practice; and having thus removed the only landmarks by which mankind can be safely guided, they throw open the door by which the secret infidelity of the heart will develop itself in practice; and instead of a visible, divine standard, to conformity with whose teaching all must be brought, every man is at liberty, (although Barclay, Gurney, and Penn will not admit it) to stand upon his own ground, and pleading the guidance of the inward light—to do what—and as he pleases. For the inward light is never to be brought to the examination of either reason or scripture. Where then shall we stop? We enter upon a downward path, the moment we deny the Bible to be the supreme standard to man of his faith and practice; and can any man lay his hand upon the precise point in the gradation where the rule will cease to apply? The Friends must each stand sponsor for all the consequences naturally and necessarily flowing from their rule, if they adopt the rule as theirs. Will the Socinian who denies that Jesus Christ is God enter heaven because pleading the guidance of the inward light? Or will the deist whose amiable views of his race will not permit him to think so basely of them, as that they need a Saviour and a revelation, be saved, because his light taught him so? Yet this is the fatal consequence of the argument pushed only to its legitimate length. We may safely presume that Friends do not see these results as likely to ensue; and yet, within the circle of our own acquaintance we have seen many cases in which they have ensued. And the memorable schism caused by Hicks is a standing monument of the folly and delusiveness of the so-called rule of faith of the Friends. That Hicks was wrong we know by the scriptures; but no Friend can prove him wrong by a “light” that is not to be brought to the test of either reason or scripture.

We are compelled to pass over much upon this subject, to which we could wish to refer; but there is one other consequence flowing from this doctrine, which we may not pass over,

viz: *that if a man think himself right he is safe.* We have heard this tenet advanced by Friends as one of the tenets of their system; and because it is intimately connected with the doctrine here discussed, we wish to show how naturally it flows from it, and to what it leads. It constitutes an essential feature of the inward light that it should be wholly independent of human control and of human caprice. No human laws can regulate the operation of God's own Spirit. His suggestions are free and independent of humanity. Whatever they may be, they must be obeyed, and no creeds or confessions of faith can check or control them. The Holy Spirit has an undoubted right to direct me as he pleases. He is at perfect liberty to make such communications to me as he deems best; and it is impious, on their own showing, for Friends to establish a creed and confession of faith, by which the Spirit must regulate his communications. Has he ever said that he will confine himself to a particular standard, and shape his communications by that? Certainly not. Their theory is that the light within is superior to the scriptures, and that the two have no necessary connection. In other words, the Spirit may suggest what the Bible does not. We know it is said, the two cannot disagree. But who is to be the judge of the Spirit's suggestions? No one has a right to determine for us that the Spirit has not suggested what we assert with equal confidence it has. And because others have not received this communication, they cannot therefore determine that we have not. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth." It was to be poured upon certain in the latter days, and there is no reason if it so please, why it should not be poured upon us in larger measure than upon George Fox. If this be so (and their fundamental principle is gone, if it be not), then the conclusion at which we arrive, is, that a man's consciousness, to which no other earthly being can witness, testifying that the Spirit has made to him a communication, that communication may be intended for his especial guidance, and his salvation on Friends's theory, may depend on its being followed. It matters little what the communication may be, or what its character; whether it conform to scripture or do not conform; whether any one else has received it or no one else. It is a communication addressed to us by Him who submits never to the impious question, "What doest thou?" The communication, of which if we are not con-

scious of it, we can of course know nothing, is addressed to us especially, and we must follow it, even if it direct us to pursue a course that is not marked out in the Bible, and which is apparently inharmonious with some of its directions; and no man can question our right to follow the commands of the Spirit, or call us to account for our conduct. If it be replied that this doctrine is never pushed to this extreme by Friends, we answer that the consequence flows necessarily and naturally from the principle of the inward light; and for the reason given above, the Christian, the Deist, the Atheist, the Mohammedan, and the Hottentot, are all upon a par, and may all be saved. The "light" within is sufficient to guide them, and if all avow its guidance who dare contradict their avowal? He would need a special communication to that effect; and suppose he assert such a communication, what endless confusion, confusion worse confounded, would be the result.

But we must close. We have much more to say upon this theme; but we have already gone beyond the limit which we had prescribed for ourselves. The questions we have now to submit are these: Who is the judge of goodness on earth? Have we any standard of right and wrong? On Friends theory the scripture is not the standard, and the inward light is. This inward light cannot be brought to the test of either reason or scripture. The conclusion then is obvious; if we have no other test than this, no other person beside ourselves can claim to know what peculiar revelations God has made to us. And if we assert that we know ourselves to be under the guidance of the inward light at this moment, and that what we do, we do by its suggestions, no matter what those suggestions may be, no man has the right to deny the genuineness and authenticity of my communications from the Spirit, simply because it differs from his. We are precluded from all standards but the light within; and unquestionably our light is as good as their light, and if theirs is to be the judge of mine, mine may be the judge of theirs; and then it follows, that each must frame his life by what he conceives to be his own light, because his light is the only guide he can have, and he is responsible for its use. What a Babel of crime would ensue if this doctrine were universally received.

Thank God that the Friends have in their inconsistency adopted a confession and a creed, even though it overturn their fundamental principle.

ART. III.—*The Statesmen of the Commonwealth of England, with a treatise on the popular progress in English History.* By John Forster, of the Inner Temple. Edited by J. O. Choules. New York. Harper and Brothers, 1846. pp. 629.

THE cycle of the great rebellion, beginning from the parliament of 1628 and ending at the restoration of a Stuart, is the golden age of English history in many respects. The battle which was fought in that day between monarchy and liberty was a much more important one than that of Dunbar or of Worcester. The men of the people and the heir and successor of ancient kings were engaged then in as momentous a struggle as Pharsalia or Waterloo. Monarchy rode as it were upon the sky, higher than the highest; and the souls of many were bound to it by spells of superstitious enchantment. Liberty sprang up from her birth-place in the spirits of the humble and contrite, the fairest of earthly forms, speaking with grave face and with deathless resolve, of ancient landmarks, of rights immemorial or inherent. It may well be doubted whether there ever was a more momentous struggle; one in which the latent strong elements of human nature were more deeply engaged; one in which the prizes were so definitely those blessings of human life which are held to be priceless by men who are above mere sensuality; or one which has left to posterity more excellent examples of exalted worth.

It is but six-and-twenty years since the death of Napoleon Buonaparte. It is one hundred and eighty-nine since that of Oliver Cromwell. While we are surprised at the number of books written on the career of the Corsican, recent and dazzling as it is, there have been published within about a twelvemonth past, from no mean hands, as many as three new works relating to the English commonwealth.

There is a sublimity about the eminent men of that day for

which a parallel can scarcely be found elsewhere than in the inspired records of the Hebrew prophets; whose strict conscientiousness, and the grave and measured significancy of their conduct, it has been matter of especial jeer at the Puritans that they made their models. Attacked in succeeding times with unparalleled bitterness by the flatterers of the restored Stuarts, made the butt of satire, the victims of pretended history, and the laughing stock of courtly romance, their deathless names have been slowly finding their way to the deepest reverence of freemen and protestants everywhere, as men who loved liberty and truth better than life, and who bear a resemblance, not wholly fanciful to the Elijahs, the Daniels and the Ezekiels of God's earlier people. A happier theme could hardly have been found anywhere for a volume such as Mr. Forster's, than the statesmen of the commonwealth of England. It will probably be long before we shall see a better work on that subject; one which may so advantageously take the place of any or all of the old jacobite and conservative advocates and apologists on the historic shelf of the student.

Just after the establishment of American Independence, it was thought that a free nation here, using the English language, yet separated by the ocean from the deadly influences exerted by pageants, pensions, courts, and the other splendours of monarchy, on historic and social opinions, and having its nativity in a period of singular justness of thought on such subjects, would be the place of all, where justice might be hoped for in relation to the lofty deeds and principles of the martyrs for truth and freedom in the old times, in the mother country and elsewhere. Until recently however, such hopes have been almost ridiculously abortive in regard to probably a majority of American readers. Clarendon, Hume, Walter Scott, courtiers, infidel splenetics, masked jacobites catering for morbid tory appetites, romantic insidious conservatives ready to chime in with any taste which would be propitious in the bookseller's shop; men who saw in Charles a martyr, in Laud a saint, and in Lauderdale a patriot; men in whose eyes crowns shine brighter than true liberty; men whose spirits glow with sincere admiration only for the Ormonds, the Montroses, and the Claverhouses, blind mad-cap champions for kings, right or wrong; such men have been thought worthy to be heard concerning the Puritans,

the long parliament, and the covenants! To such men, too many of us have given countenance, while they have been re-immolating Hampden, Vane, Sydney, and Russell, the victims of their model kings, with worse weapon than sword or axe, an envenomed pen, which martyrs those good names and stirring examples which they died to transmit to after ages. The work before us, though not the only proof by any means, is one of the most pleasing proofs that the light of a better day is approaching, when history will better fulfil her office as defined by the Roman master: *Precipuum munus annalium reor, ne virtutes sileantur; utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit.*

The effect of this volume on the attentive reader will be to revive his interest in the deep and gorgeous drama transacted in that period of history, and to refresh, and, on many points, enlarge his knowledge of the facts connected with it. This article would embrace the occasion of a new contribution, so manifestly respectable, to the history of that period, to review the early part of the great struggle by which it is signalized. The party which supported Charles I. besides their appropriate style and title of Royalists, assumed to themselves the title also of Loyalists, adherents to the laws and constitution of the realm. To their opponents they gave as their posterity still give to our fathers of the American Revolution, the title of Rebels. Is this nomenclature in accordance with truth? Which of the parties adhered truly to the provisions of the English fundamental laws in church and state? These questions seem to involve all that is really important in the subject. True, they may not present the main point to all minds. There may be some readers, good gentle souls, long since emigrant from the ground of fact and argument to other climes and balmy breezes, to whom the "Blessed King and Martyr" is all the more blessed and a martyr, for every accumulation of proof that he would have destroyed English liberty, as he would have shouted their shibboleth over its ruins; to whom Laud is all the more a saint and martyr, as it was to a puritan parliament, and in a puritan and perverse generation, that he so often broke faith to church and to state and to God. The sublime slumbers of these magnificent celestials, it is not proposed to disturb. Others there may be, on the other hand, who think, that the vast superiority of the puritans over the royalists in personal virtue, in manliness of aim

and purpose, in fidelity to the will of God as apprehended in the scriptures, and in that firmness of spirit usually connected with a mind obedient to the dictates of conscience—and vast was their superiority in these respects—carries all questions of right and wrong in their favour. But had the surviving men of the commonwealth been tried at the Restoration, by courts of law as inflexibly just, as they were in fact, for the most part, contemptibly otherwise, these advantages of general character would not have, and ought not to have, acquitted them. Before fair tribunals, answers in their favour to the questions above stated, would have acquitted them. Besides, placing the inquiry on any other than constitutional grounds would be an opposite error analogous to one of the weakest moods of malignancy itself; judging great questions by some small concomitants, according as they are picturesque or romantic, opposing the noblest of men in the best of causes, for their guilty nasal twang, their atrocious cropt hair, and their awful and boding Geneva cap; choosing a historical opinion, as Sir Walter Scott says he himself did, “as King Charles II. did his religion, from an idea that the cavalier creed was the more gentlemanlike persuasion of the two.”

The checks upon the crown which entitle the British monarchy to be styled limited, are traced by some writers, among whom are Montesquieu and Sir William Blackstone, to the usages of the Saxons while yet in their ancestral homes in the forests of Germany; though it cannot probably be ascertained at this day precisely how far such checks then extended. In the Witana Gemote, or Congress of the Wise, in King Alfred's times, whom he consulted about his laws, and “they then said that they were all willing to observe them,” we certainly see a resemblance to the modern free legislation by king, lords and commons; and traces of a compact of the same description appear, even amidst the horrors of the Norman conquest, in the obligation which the conqueror took and confirmed by his coronation-oath, to preserve the ancient laws and liberties of the kingdom. And although a great real change occurred, notwithstanding this respect for the forms of liberty, at that period, when the tremendous feudal system was established, the nation treated as a mere extended camp, and the king as captain-general, regarded as the only fountain of titles to personal freedom and to ownership in the soil, as well as to offices of honour or emolument; yet Blackstone

says that after all, the people were defrauded of their liberties rather by the art and finesse of the Norman lawyers, than deprived by the force of the Norman arms.

According to their different views of the results of the conquest, writers have adopted different theories in relation to the charters of rights, which began soon after to be obtained from the kings; the liberal writers regarding them either as steps in return to the ancient Saxon liberties which still rightfully belonged to the people, or as new acts of compact with the crown, as valid as if they had been ancient, on the same grounds on which any investment of rights is valid; and the writers on the arbitrary side regarding them as infringements of the royal prerogative, of no validity, because extorted under duress. But if these liberties were lost at first by the violence of the conquest it surely displays a very ill-timed love of quiet to object to the far less violent and generally bloodless process by which they were recovered by charter. We have adopted a briefer and clearer theory on this subject in America. We hold that men who wrest their liberties from tyrants, whether by charter, by redress of grievances, or by a recognition of independence achieved by successful revolution, recover thereby not their ancestral, but their natural and inalienable liberties, of which their existence itself is a charter from the Highest of Kings. This was the ground of that far-seeing wise man, Sir Harry Vane, even as early as the times of the English rebellion. But on the lower ground, if the king as captain of the military forces in a feudal kingdom, be regarded as having possessed a rightful claim to be lord of the liberties of the people, because he possessed the power to be so, there are three ways by which he might grant, and the people recover those liberties; either of which is as sacred, as much a *jus divinum*, has as good a title to be regarded as fundamental in human government, as the right of kings: 1, By charters granted to the people; 2, By solemn appeals to God in coronation-oaths; 3, By permitting usages of limit to the prerogative to grow up in the legal tribunals, and become established on the principles of common law. And all three of these safeguards were in appliance to the liberties of the English people at the commencement of the seventeenth century.

1. The Charter which the barons of England obtained from

king John, about the beginning of the thirteenth century, at Runnymede, was, in part, a statutory confirmation of the ancient maxims and usages of common law ; and in part it acquired new liberties for the subject ; for example, where it prohibits the sovereign from suspending or evading the laws, and guarantees to the subject his life, liberty and property, until he is deprived of them by a legal process. It interposed against an evasion of acknowledged law. Other laws bound the subject, this bound the sovereign, not to attain his ends otherwise than by legal means. This great charter, with some twenty confirmations which it had received from numerous Parliaments, including of course as many royal assents, previously to the time of Charles I, was then, as much as it had ever been, the fundamental law of the realm.

2. Blackstone gives a copy of the coronation-oath of the ancient English kings, preserved, he tells us, in a book printed as early as the reign of Edward IV. which binds the king to "guarantee to his people the enjoyment of the laws and customs of the realm ; and by his power, to guard and confirm what the people have made and chosen" as law. Here he recognised the right of the estates of the people—*lez gentes du people*—to make and choose their laws, and consented, on oath, to the restriction of his prerogative. Archbishop Laud was charged on his trial, with having inserted into this oath, without any right to do so, a saving of the king's prerogative, when he administered it to Charles. But to that charge the archbishop replied, that the insertion was as early as Edward VI. or Elizabeth ; and besides its collocation gave it no force as to the civil laws of the kingdom, but only as to the king's supremacy in religion. The present coronation-oath is substantially the same, though the phraseology was altered at the accession of William and Mary.

3. The Common Law is of the nature of a compact between king and subjects ; as it contains provisions to govern each party in its appropriate sphere. This is specially clear since the conquest. Bracton, a legal writer as early as Henry III. says that the king must do nothing except what can be legally done, because it is a maxim of the Common Law : *rex debet esse sub lege, quia lex facit regem*—the king ought to be subject to the law, because the law makes the king ; teaching not only that the king is under law, but that he is its creature, and not the free-

holder of a *jus divinum*. Fenner, a very eminent divine in the reign of Elizabeth, taught in a work on "Sacred Theology," even in such days as those, that the English parliament may justly depose a tyrant who commits wilful breaches of the compact between him and the commonwealth. And the Scottish ambassadors told that arbitrary sovereign herself, that "the Scots were a free nation, made king whom they freely chose, and with the same freedom unkinged him if they saw cause, by right of ancient laws and ceremonies yet remaining, and old customs yet among the Highlanders in choosing the heads of their clans, or families; all which, with many other arguments, bore witness, that regal power was nothing else but a mutual covenant or stipulation between king and people." *Milton's Prose Works*, Vol. I. pp. 386, 395.

It is not to be pretended that the parliament of such a realm may not become really and guiltily rebellious, and trench more than legally on the royal prerogative; or that every opposition of parliament to king in a nation enjoying ancient established laws, is of course justifiable. It is a question of fact, as to the rights of king on one hand and people on the other; and it is utterly insoluble in any other court than that of prejudice or unreason, without a strict comparison of the facts established on each side, with what was binding as law on both parties. That is a point of view in which unfortunately this question has rarely been placed. A negative on the acts of parliament, the power of prorogation and dissolution, the power to appoint and remove judges and ministers, with other inevitable patronage and influence of the crown are however much stronger shields of the crown against resistance except for the most notorious and overwhelming reasons, than any possessed on the other side. But if a king of that realm habitually violate the compact and invade the liberties of the people, either it is as Milton said, "a ridiculous and painted freedom fit to cozen babies," a constitution without safeguards, a limited monarchy without a limiting power, the people have rights which cannot be maintained without wrong, or else the redress is in the parliament, and a nation may without moral turpitude, stand by its parliament and its laws against its king. Resistance under such circumstances, so far from incurring the just opprobrium of rebellion, if it be waged with the proper means, is the best proof the parliament and the

people can give, of true loyalty to the constitution of government as it of right is. If not, then English liberty is moonshine. It cannot survive the reign of a single able and wilful monarch.

We must now turn our attention to the ecclesiastical constitution of England at the accession of Charles I. to the throne. The acts of parliament establishing the church under Elizabeth, especially that concerning the Supremacy, were not as bold as the similar laws under Henry VIII. The title Supreme Head was left out of the oath, perhaps on account of the scruples which Burnet says were put into her head by Lever, and which seems to have been regarded by some sturdy protestants as a courtesy to the Pope; more probably from a dread on the part of the ambitious but sensitive Queen of being linked in satire with Pope Joan. The authority which this act conferred on the Queen was: to be "supreme governor in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal within her dominions;" and her subjects were required to renounce all foreign power and jurisdiction, under the penalty, not of a *praemunire*, as was the case under Henry VIII. but simply of ejection from any office under the crown. These circumstances, together with the strict respect paid throughout those vascillating times in England, to the forms of parliamentary sanction, even when parliament itself was entirely supple and compliant, with other similar considerations to be found in the history of those times, incline one to the belief that the act of supremacy was not intended to give the sovereign any legislative power in the church, but was in part aimed at the papacy, and in part, gave the Queen the same executive authority in the church which she possessed in the civil state. At least this view of the subject seems most consistent and satisfactory; though the whole figment of earthly headship over the church of Christ, whether in the shape of Buckingham Palace or the Vatican, is to a staunch, sound protestant, as hard to understand as to believe. On the powers of the royal supremacy was founded the famous court of High Commission, instead of the single Lord-Vicerent who had served Henry VIII.; which may be compared to a commission of the great seal, instead of a single Lord Keeper, or Chancellor. The power of this court was not only executive in its character, as has been shown, but it was the gift of parliament; or at least recognized only as consistent with the just power of the legislature itself.

The parliament of that nation is, and in protestant times has ever been, the legislature of the church as well as of the state. It was parliament which ordained the eucharist in both kinds, the book of common prayer, the fastings and holydays; the same authority required the subscription of the clergy to the thirty-nine articles; passed the corporation (or as it might properly be called, the passive obedience and non-resistance) act of 1661; the famous test, conventicle, and five-mile acts in the same reign; the act of toleration, under William and Mary; and that for Catholic emancipation in 1829. The convocation of the clergy was a sort of ecclesiastical Parliament, anciently; but the power of making canons was taken from them under Henry VIII; and their proceedings have since been of no great importance.

Peter Wentworth said in a speech before the Commons, that "he had heard from old parliament men, that the banishment of the pope and popery, and the restoring of true religion, had their beginning from that house, and not from the bishops;" even in the reign of Mary, there was in that floor, a band of patriots brave enough to protest against the infamy of those days of blood, and when their remonstrances were unavailing, to secede openly from the House. Under Elizabeth the heart of that House, and of the great mass of those whom they represented was Protestant, and in avowed and earnest sympathy with the Protestants of other nations. Puritanism, yet in its brave infancy, was already striving, a monster in each hand, to strangle both superstition and tyranny:

“ἐπιστίθειον Ἡρακλῆα

Θῆρε δὺω κείρεσσιν ἀπρὶξ ἀπαλαῖσιν ἔχοντα;”

participating deeply, from its birth in England, of those aspirations for civil freedom which the revival of pure religion was producing every where. Elizabeth herself, an able and splendid demagogue, owed her success to some romance connected with a sceptre in the hands of a woman, to her courteous personal behaviour to the people, and to the grace with which she yielded to the popular will when it became necessary to yield, and even won new favour where a less politic ruler would have provoked odium, rather than to any blindness of the people to the despotism which she was sometimes inclined to practice. With a cru-

cifix, an image of the Virgin, and of St. John, in her private chapel, she yet championed the cause of Protestantism throughout Europe. In the civil war in France between the Catholics headed by Guise, and the Protestants under Condé and Coligny, she was in league with the latter party; and sent them aid which was designed to be of more service than it was. Ten years later, after the dire night of Bartholomew, she made her position so definite among the nations, that the Catholic states from Venice to the English channel, regarded her as their most formidable enemy, and were ready at any moment for a combination to strike her down; whilst the Protestants of Germany, the Netherlands, and France were ready to rally round the English standard, and to concede its right to the van of the Protestant array. When the expedition of Montgomery failed to succour the Rochellers in 1573, the bishop of London, and the Earl of Essex, in the name of the nobility, clergy, and people, earnestly memorialized the government in behalf of the foreign Protestants. Elizabeth well knew, and was so wise as rarely if ever, to insult, the feelings of her people on this subject. During the memorable negotiations of the Duke of Alençon for her hand in matrimony, when the Duke requested, in his letters, permission to visit her in person, "she lovingly advised him," says McIntosh, "not to come until he had first atoned for dyeing his sword in the blood of the Rochellers, and secured a good reception in England by some notable testimony of his affection to the protestants of France;" though it is not improbable that her own inclinations were already in his favour, without the atonement she declares to be necessary to conciliate her people.

The protestant feeling of the nation was not growing weaker during the reign of James I.; while the system of petty royal stratagem which that sorry Malvolio invented, and to which he gave the appropriate name of kingcraft, was felt rather as the sting of an insect, than as the rod of an oppressor. A scene occurred in the Parliament of 1620-21, which might have administered most impressive admonition to any other ears than those of a Stuart. Frederick the Elector Palatine, (son-in-law of James) was engaged in a struggle with the Emperor in which he was regarded as the leader of the Protestant cause, and received assistance from most of the states of that party. The thirty years war was commencing, which so deeply enlisted the

protestant spirit of Europe by a most formidable combination to crush truth and freedom. All ranks in England were on fire to range themselves by the side of their brethren on the continent in such a cause. The king observed a cold neutrality; and when two thousand four hundred English volunteers embarked for the Palatinate, it was with his disapprobation. He had recently (1618) sacrificed Sir Walter Raleigh to do a pleasure to Catholic Spain; and negociations were now carrying on for the marriage of Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta. These things gave just alarm to the Commons, and they remonstrated with the king in relation to them. He answered, bidding them not presume to meddle with deep matters of state which were above their capacity; and after a second remonstrance, in which they assert their ancient and undoubted right to give counsel in all matters of government, and to use perfect freedom of speech, they are informed that his majesty expects them to adjourn over the summer. Before separating however, these strong men "voted a solemn declaration of their resolve to spend their lives and fortunes in defence of the Protestant cause; and this declaration was sounded forth with the voices of them all, withal lifting up their hats in their hands so high as they could hold them, as a visible testimony of their unanimous consent, in such sort that the like had scarce had ever been seen in Parliament."

Forster, p. 139. Neither the wisdom of the Hebrew, nor (taking the short step of the proverb) of the British Solomon, could have cajoled, Cæsar could not have coerced, such men. That was the commencement of the great struggle. Coke, Selden, Pym, Phillips, Hampden were there. It was no mere O'Connell agitation; no senseless feud of Carlist and Christino; no ardour superstition excited against the encroachments of moral light; no infidel insurrection in behalf of the goddess of Reason; it was a struggle of devout and heroic men, deeply versed in the scriptures, and knowing and prizing their civil rights, to transmit to their children a pure religion and a free state.

There are two other points on which testimony must be adduced in order to a judgment of the case between the parties who are coming before us; the doctrines of the church of England, and its attitude in relation to ceremonies, or things indifferent, in the times preceding the reign of Charles. That the doctrines held and taught in that communion at that period were

decidedly calvinistic, her articles, catechisms, interpretations, the well known sentiments of her reformers, and subsequent ministers, the employment of continental Calvinists as professors in the universities, and the use of Calvin's Institutes as the textbook of theology place beyond reasonable doubt. Arminius himself was not perverted until 1591. The chair of divinity in the university of Leyden, in which he first publicly promulgated the new theology, was occupied until 1602, by the illustrious Francis Junius, a very different character. In that very interval (in 1595,) a series of articles was drawn up at the palace of Archbishop Whitgift, thence called the Lambeth Articles, by that primate himself, and others of the most exalted members of the church, as their interpretation of her standards, which will probably be thought by the intelligent reader to differ from the doctrines of the reformation on the side opposite to Arminianism. They are as follows: 1, "God from eternity hath predestinated certain men unto life, certain men he hath reprobated. 2, The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the person predestinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God. 3, There is predetermined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished. 4, Those who are not predestinated to salvation shall be necessarily damned for their sins. 5, A true, living, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the elect, neither finally nor totally. 6, A man truly faithful, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying faith, is certain, with the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation in Christ. 7, Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved, if they will. 8, No man can come to Christ, unless it shall be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to the Son. 9, It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved." *Short's Hist. Ch. of England*, p. 161.

It is well known that there were delegates from England in the Synod of Dort, by which the doctrines of Arminius were condemned. King James sent the above articles to that synod by his delegates, as he sent them also to Ireland, as the faith pro-

fessed in England. *Forster*, p. 154. Bishop Hall was one of the English delegates to the Synod of Dort; and in a sermon which he delivered before that body on the 29th November, 1618, he said that king James had specially commanded the delegation, of which he was a member, to urge one thing there with all their might, that the church of Holland should adhere (against the Arminians) to the common faith contained in the standards of their own and the other churches. And the same prelate said, in his *Irenicum*, published still later: "Blessed be God, there is no difference, in any essential point between the church of England and her sister reformed churches; the only difference between us consists in our mode of constituting the external ministry." We shall find the government of Charles I. trampling on the constitution of the church on this point, as well as on others.

There was a well known difference between the two sections of the reformation, the English and Lutherans on the one hand, and the Scottish and the continental churches (besides the Lutherans) on the other, as to the principle by which they should be guided in appointing ceremonies in the church. The principle of the latter party was that nothing should be ordained in the church which had not the positive warrant of scripture; the principle of the former was that things are lawful which are not forbidden in scripture. The one enacted nothing which was unscriptural; the other nothing which was anti-scriptural. The one required the authority of scripture for its ordinances, and ceremonies; the other was satisfied if its ordinances and ceremonies were not contrary to the written word. Inspiration was consulted for directions in the one case; whatever species of consent silence may be supposed to give, was held sufficient in the other. The English church itself, in the convocation of 1562, escaped as narrowly as by the majority of one vote, in one hundred and seventeen, from a reformation on something like the Genevan plan as to ceremonies. The question as to the genuineness of that clause of her 20th article which says: "the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in matters of faith," is one of the most curious in history. That clause was not in the Latin manuscript signed by the convocation of 1562, nor in the English manuscript signed by the convocation of 1571, nor in either the English or Latin edition pub-

lished at the latter date by bishop Jewel; though it is found in one case as early 1563, and appears frequently, late in the reign of Elizabeth. In his record of the debates in parliament on this point, early in the reign of that queen, Burnet says (vol. 2, p. 616) that the commons certainly, and probably the lords also, had attended a conference between the Protestant and Catholic divines at Westminster, where they heard the matter discussed, preparatory to the legislation for the church on which they were about to enter; and he gives a summary of the paper drawn up by the Protestant divines at the conference, instead of giving the speeches in parliament on that side. In this way we reach both civil and ecclesiastical opinions on the subject. He says, one of the rules they offered about ceremonies was, "that they should not be made necessary parts of worship." Neither Hooper nor Parker was consecrated in vestments according to the rubric. The former said prophetically that being first brought in as things indifferent, they would at length be maintained as things necessary. To have fulfilled this prophecy, to have made things imperative in the church which are indifferent in scripture, to have bound men's consciences on points on which it is admitted that God has not bound them, is one of the most dubious honours of the Laudean and Oxfordite school. "It has ever been the desire of this house"—said Pym on the floor of parliament—"expressed in many parliaments in Queen Elizabeth's time and since, that such as are scrupulous in using some things enjoined, which are held by those who enjoin them, to be in themselves indifferent, should be tenderly used." *Forster*, p. 166.

The scope of this article does not include the protectorate of Cromwell; because our point is loyalty to the English constitution in its ancient shape, trying the parties respectively by it, so long as they professed to act under it. Let us place ourselves for this purpose at the third Parliament of Charles I. in 1628, the third year of his reign, as a point from which the elements of the great struggle are distinctly visible. The king had then been on the throne a briefer lapse of time than the term of an American President; and yet he had made more numerous and more serious thrusts at the liberties of the nation than had been made during the entire reign of Elizabeth. Nearly every eminent man in England, including Lord Falkland, and Wentworth

afterwards Earl Strafford, was in opposition. The expedition under Admiral Pennington, which King James had fitted out against Spain, was by express orders from both the King and the Duke of Buckingham, of which the originals are still in existence, diverted from that destination, and sent to assist the Catholics of France against the Protestants of Rochelle. It was the earnest wish of the people, whose fathers remembered the changeful times of Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, that the queen of Charles should be a Protestant, that the heir to the throne, should it be his son, might not imbibe from maternal influence a faith different from that of the nation he was to govern. But before his accession he had paid his addresses to a princess of Spain; he had afterwards married a zealous papist, Henrietta of France. The duties on imported goods, called tonnage and poundage, had been granted to every sovereign since Henry VI. by statute passed at the beginning of the reign and to continue until its expiration. There was no reluctance felt that the King's treasury should receive the proceeds of this tariff. That was the ancient usage. But other sovereigns had acknowledged that the right to grant those duties was only in the representatives of the people; and had obtained them in that legal way. Charles had disdained to request such a grant, and had claimed and levied these duties from the beginning as in his own right, and independently of parliament. *Blackstone*, vol. I. p. 316. This was a breach of the main-spring of liberty; and the policy had been sufficiently developed at the time of the third Parliament, or very soon afterwards, to convict the court of treason before an impartial tribunal, had such a one existed. It snapped asunder the immemorial check on executive usurpation which had been of strength to restrain the Edwards and Richards of old. Clarendon himself records that in these years "new projects were every day set on foot for money;" commissions were appointed to increase the revenue of the crown lands; excessive fines were imposed on persons (except papists) whom the government could catch or construe into the attitude of religious recusancy, who were likely to be many, as Laud had publicly renounced the former interpretation of the doctrinal articles, and was industriously innovating ceremonies; privy seals were issued for the loan of money from private persons; a levy was laid to defray the expense of ships which were *not* building; and the

proceeds of these portentous ways and means, seldom went into the king's coffers, but supplied the Wolseian profusion and magnificence of the Duke of Buckingham. State offices and honours, and even sometimes the crown lands were sold, and tallies struck as if the money had gone into the exchequer; entries on the record were so tampered with as to confound the duke's with the royal funds; while the favourite himself rioted in luxury and excess. He is said to have sometimes decked himself at one toilette in dress to the amount of £80,000. And finally came the General Forced Loan, exacted by committees of inquisition sent into every quarter of the kingdom. *Forster* 17. As the yet unapostate Wentworth exclaimed, "they had torn up the roots of all property." The modern church of England is imperfect in her defiance of Puritanism; Charles is her "Blessed king and martyr;" Laud is to a great extent her favourite modern saint; she should have assigned an illustrious place in the same calender to Villiers as the Fabricius among her civil worthies.

Those who resisted this system of lawless plunder, whether entitled to the shield of parliamentary privilege or not, were hurled into prison, Clarendon adds, "with circumstances unusual and unheard of." Among them, and the authority just quoted says they were "many, of the best quality and condition under the peerage," were Carlton, Valentine, Denzil Hollis, John Hampden and Sir John Eliot members of parliament at a very early period, and many others at a later; whose names merit and are receiving the richest blazonry with which the gratitude of a free posterity can adorn them. The first three were released on the payment of heavy fines; Hampden was first thrown into the Gate House prison, and afterwards transferred to a confinement in Hampshire; while Eliot, having settled his worldly affairs before he went to the parliament of 1626, in anticipation of laying down life in the struggle, was imprisoned once, before 1628; was released to attend in that body, in which he still evinced the same undaunted spirit, and uttered the same manly and stirring eloquence as before; was again imprisoned, in the Tower, in 1629; and died there three years later, a death over which sorrow and glory met together as they have met over few statesmen since time began. The personal liberty invaded by these acts of the court is treated in the Great Charter and in the various statutes confirming that instrument as an inalienable

right of the people of even a higher dignity than their right of property. Quartering, or as it was termed, billeting, soldiers in private dwellings, without the consent of the owners, and without remuneration, was another custom of the "Blessed" king; rendered probably a more stinging outrage to their feelings than any, by the fact that the soldiers were the remains of the miserable Spanish expedition, habituated to "robberies, burglaries, rapes, rapines, murders and barbarous cruelties," so that there was a general cry of terror wherever they came. This was one of the king's methods of punishing those who too loudly groaned under his administration; and it must be admitted to entitle him to the praise of horrible ingenuity. The poor who breathed any audible sighs for liberty, and were too humble to afford barrack-accommodations, too undistinguished for the prison or the pillory, were coerced into the ranks of the army or navy; and the obedient judges in the courts contented themselves with the royal authority and confirmed these things as law. The shocking picture becomes complete when we turn our eyes to the clergy, at least those of them who claimed then, as their admirers do now, to be heaven's exclusive ministers in England, the Lauds, Mainwarings, Sibthorpes and Montagues, and others from whose mellow infamy posterity has averted its notice too much even to inflict historic justice upon them and behold them, amid amiable qualms of conscience lest they should break the rubric in matters of vestment or posture, preaching that "the king could make laws and do whatsoever pleased him; that he was not bound by any pre-existing law respecting the rights of the subject; and that his sole will in imposing taxes without the consent of Parliament obliged the subjects' conscience on pain of eternal damnation." *Foster*, pp. 17, 150. A speech of Lord Falkland, who is surely unexceptionable authority, delivered in the long parliament in retrospect of the times of which we are speaking, may probably meet the reader's acceptance here: "The truth is, Mr. Speaker," said he, "that as some ill ministers in our state first took away our money from us, and afterwards endeavoured to make our money not worth the taking, by turning it into brass by a kind of anti-philosopher's stone: so these men used us in the point of preaching: first, depressing it to their power, and next labouring to make it such, as the harm had not been much if it had been depressed; the most frequent

subjects even in the most sacred auditories being the *jus divinum* of bishops and tithes, the sacredness of the clergy, the sacrilege of impropriations, the demolishing of puritanism and propriety, the building of the prerogative at Paul's, the introduction of such doctrines as, admitting them true, the truth would not recompense the scandal: or of such as were so far false that, as Sir Thomas More says of the casuists, their business was not to keep men from sinning, but to inform them, *Quam prope ad peccatum sine peccato liceat accedere*; so it seemed their work was to try how much of a papist might be brought in without popery, and to destroy as much as they could of the gospel, without bringing themselves into danger of being destroyed by the law. Mr. Speaker, to go yet farther, some of them have so industriously laboured to deduce themselves from Rome, that they have given great suspicion that in gratitude they desire to return thither, or at least to meet it half way; some have evidently laboured to bring in an English though not a Roman popery; I mean not only the outside and dress of it, but equally absolute; a blind dependence of the people upon the clergy, and of the clergy upon themselves; and have opposed the papacy beyond the *seas* that they might settle one beyond *the water*, (i. e. trans. Thames, at Lambeth, *Dr. Arnold*.) Nay, common fame is more than ordinarily false, if none of them have found a way to reconcile the opinions of Rome to the preferments of England; and be so absolutely, directly and cordially papists, that it is all that £1500 a year can do to keep them from confessing it." See *Arnold's Lectures on History*.

In the memorable third parliament of Charles, 1628, the Commons, led by the sublime eloquence of Eliot and Pym, the legal erudition of Coke and Selden, the unshaken firmness of Hampden and Cromwell, passed the famous statute known as the PETITION OF RIGHTS, with great unanimity, and obtained, after much shuffling and evasion, the assent of the Lords, and of the king to that instrument in a regular parliamentary manner. This was a re-affirmation of Magna Charta, and of the other six ancient statutes, 25, 28, 37, 38, and 42 Edward III. and the 17 Richard II, guaranteeing in the most distinct terms, the life, liberty and property of the subject, except by due process of law, taking from the servile judges their plea, then fashionable, of antagonist enactments, and binding them to a strict construction.

Hume thinks that this statute produced a change in the government almost equivalent to a revolution—the greatest sacrifice to truth which the frail veracity of that writer could afford on the occasion; but artfully framed to produce the impression, that the six ancient statutes which the Petition of Rights merely repeated and re-affirmed, had not been of binding force before such re-affirmation, and consequently that the tyranny of king Charles previously to that time had not been in violation of any laws then in force. But such a defence is of no force whatever. The statute passed in the 25 Edward I., known as the *confirmatio cartarum*, had been directed to be allowed as the Common Law of the land, and copies of it ordered to be sent to the cathedral churches and read twice a year to the people; a circumstance alluded to by Hampden, in his memorable words on refusing the forced loan after Charles's second parliament: that he could be content to lend as well as others (he was a man of great wealth and liberality) but feared to draw upon himself that curse in magna charta which should be read twice a year against those who infringe it. It is a strange defence of the executive government of that day, to allege that they had not heard, or had forgotten, the voice of magna charta proclaiming, under fearful sanctions, the liberties of the people; it is worthy, it is true, of the political morals of David Hume; but not worthy of his keen intellect; it is a confession of judgment against his royal client.

There is another reason why this unjust misguided king can derive no advantage before the bar of a justly judging posterity from this defence of his historic advocate; it is that by far the worst ten years of his terrible reign, marked by a course of keen and angry oppression of which the things which have been mentioned were but the embryos, by a visible feeling of revenge against the enactors of the Petition of Rights itself, and by signal and habitual violations, not only of the ancient statutes re-affirmed in that instrument, but of the very new obligations themselves, the cementing resolutions to which he had then assented, were the ten years which had elapsed after the adjournment of this parliament, until the day of retribution and the Long Parliament came together, in 1640. The oppressions for which he lost his life were committed in violation both of the new and the old fundamental laws; they trampled under foot not

only the grants of liberty made and confirmed to the people of England by John and the Edwards and Richard, but those also to which he himself had given a regular and constitutional assent.

It would be sickening to enter here into a very special detail of those ten years. They were years when a Stuart and a Laud tried the experiment of governing without parliament. Strafford had apostatized from the popular party and taken the place in the royal favour from which the Duke of Buckingham had been plucked by the hand of an assassin. Dr. Mainwaring had been impeached by the Commons in the late parliament for the peculiar abjectness of his public teachings in relation to the religious duty of unlimited passive obedience on the part of the subject. But such teachings were in those days the true gate to ecclesiastical preferments. Laud was made Archbishop of Canterbury; Montague, bishop of Chichester, and Mainwaring bishop of St. Davids.

The effort to Arminianize the church was steadily prosecuted. The directions of king James to the clergy forbidding doctrinal preaching, which were understood by the people, and administered by the church authorities as virtually silencing the Calvinistic clergy, and encouraging the Arminians, were revived early in the reign of Charles, at the suggestion of Bishop Laud, and a wider range was given to them than they had formerly had, so that they now applied to the bishops and deans as well as the other clergy. The venerable bishop Davenant was in 1631 called before the council-board and directed to kneel and receive a severe reprimand for preaching what, we have his own excellent authority itself for saying, was admitted to be the established doctrine of the church, by the council in the act of administering the reprimand. The charge was that he had broken the king's declaration by preaching a sermon on the doctrine of election as set forth in the seventeenth article, which was one of the high points to be forborne for the sake of peace. This is at least sufficiently intelligibly. The archbishops, both of whom were present at the council on this occasion, interpreted this famous declaration as prohibiting the preaching of what they themselves admitted to be the true sense of the articles which the parliament had enacted, and to which they themselves had pledged the faith of their signatures as the belief of the church of Eng-

land. Meanwhile, vigorous penalties were inflicted on such of the clergy as refused to read the famous book of sports, now also revived from king James's times enjoining, in the place of the afternoon lecture, dancing, leaping, archery, and may-games; and on such as preached on the Sabbath afternoon; on those who failed to remove the communion-table to the east end of the chancel to be placed there as an altar in the Romish style; and on those who catechised in any other words and manner than in the precise words of the Short Catechism in the Prayer-Book. The gorgeous figures of medieval superstition were restored to the church windows; superstitious modes of consecrating chapels, churches and church-yards were introduced; altars, pattens, chalices, altar-cloths, and the knife with which the sacramental bread should be cut, were also consecrated; men bowed on entering church, bowed to the altar, bowed at certain words in the service; the universities addressed the archbishop as "your holiness," "most holy father," "High Priest"; he assumed to himself the title: "alterius orbis papa, pope of Great Britain." Those were the days of the protestant Pharisees, if protestants they could be called; when the decalogue, judgment, mercy, the love of God were nought; the rubric, the cope, the consecrated ground, the dream-shaded window were much.

Among the most singular things in the career of this infatuated king was his enterprise to change the religion of Scotland, which meets us in the days to which we are now looking; an effort to force Episcopacy, and that too of the stamp exhibited in such men as Laud, and Montague and Mainwaring, upon the manly, earnest, living heart of Presbyterian Scotland; to bring men who had been nurtured amid the grandeur of lake and glen and mountain and cataract; and whose spirits had been fed from the meditations of their earliest days, on the heroism of Knox and Murray and Melville; and whose faith had a hold as deep as the faith of the martyr ages of old, both upon their heads and their hearts—to bring such men down to the endless genealogies, the superstitions of time and place, the genuflections, the garment-holiness, the "dim religious" windows, and the servility of spirit of the Laudean School—was the delirious undertaking of this king in the long interval between the parliaments. It was against such an enterprise, undertaken without law from parliament or assembly, that the spirit of Jenny Geddes revolted; and

Scotland's church and the flower of her nobility convened in Edinburgh, as if a voice of magic had called them from their hills, and in 1638, signed a declaration, some in letters of blood, some adding "until death," that they would abide by the pure faith of their fathers; and thus became that opprobrium of genteel romance, that glory of the annals of true heroism, the COVENANTERS.

Things went on in England not better but worse for the restraint imposed on the king by the petition of rights. A monopoly was asserted over every article of commerce, every means of comfort among the people, soap, sea-coal, hackney-coaches, wines, the dressing of meats, the marking of iron, the erection of houses. Patents and licenses were granted, and the holders were afterwards fined for availing themselves of the privileges. The Star chamber and the high commission raged as Bedlam. New oaths were imposed under penalties; new courts erected with limitless powers; the orders of the council board were directed to be received as law. In 1636 came the famous writ for ship-money, which Hampden refused to pay; and to which his resistance before a judicial tribunal, though unsuccessful, was said at the time, no doubt correctly, to have been of far more benefit to the cause of the vanquished than to that of the victor. It was as a rocket thrown up in the night in the sight of all; foreshowing the coming of the morning and of the combat in earnest. The Long Parliament met in 1640, and entered upon a vindication of the liberties of the people, upon which if they had not entered, instead of claiming the thanks and the eulogies of posterity, they would have taken their places in history along with the cravens of France who heard Louis XIV. submissively, when he bade them not meddle themselves with the registry of his edicts. In August 1642 the royal standard was raised at Nottingham, and the civil war began.

Of small force as to a correct judgment between these parties is the Jacobite offset, that if the king was oppressive, so also was the parliament in its turn, in the extraordinary means of redress which they adopted. These were not more extraordinary, far less so indeed, than the grievances which demanded them; nor were they resorted to until ordinary means became folly. An affectionate sympathy for criminals, and a nervous horror of punishment, much charity for injustice and little for the injured,

is one of the least promising moral inclinations of our times. Parliaments, laws, courts are monsters when they inflict but justice; Straffords, Lauds, Stuarts, culprits, are angels when they suffer it, though their demerits be scarlet or crimson. Could there be a restoration here, the power, the principles, and the pens of the monarchists of the old world again prevailing, then the characters of Washington and Adams, of Jefferson and Franklin, of Henry and Otis, would probably appear in the annals of history; an hundred years hence, in colours not brighter than those in which Eliot and Pym and Hampden and Vane now appear on conservative pages across the Atlantic; far less bright than those in which they justly appear in the pages of Mr. Forster. But it may be hoped that the elements of history are purifying; and that our vision no longer attracted only by the gay tournaments, the fields of the cloth of gold, the decorations and the physical prowess of man, which charmed the sensualist ages that are past, is rising higher up the mountain sides; that the wish of Goethe for us may be fulfilled in history as well as in poetry:

“America thou hast it better
Than our ancient hemisphere;
Thou hast no falling castles,
Nor basalt, as here.
Good luck wait on thy glorious spring,
And, when in time, thy poets sing,
May some good genius guard them all
From Baron, Robber, Knight, and Ghost traditional!”

We may hope to see a wiser and better estimate of human character, of its necessities and its privileges, its weakness and its strength; a fondness to contemplate the characters of those in past days who have lived near to Christ in living faith, holding the existence of eternal truth and of a world of spirits, as matters of conscious reality; an admiration for the spiritual ornaments of man. And in that day, if it come, we believe these old English PURITANS will be seen to have been the tall trees on the eastern hills, that earliest caught the rising light, and glowed richly in its golden lustre.

ART. IV.—*General Assembly of 1848.**Organization of the House.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America, met in the First Presbyterian church in the city of Baltimore, on Thursday, the 18th of May, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Thornwell on the text—“And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked; and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter.” Acts xvii. 32.

After sermon the moderator took the chair and opened the sessions with prayer. The permanent clerk, from the standing committee on commissions, reported the roll of the Assembly. The stated clerk reported the organization of the New Synod of Memphis, which was accordingly recognised. After the appointment of a committee on Elections, the Assembly adjourned until half-past four in the afternoon.

In the afternoon, after the minutes of the morning session had been read, the assembly proceeded to the election of Moderator, and the roll being called, it appeared that the Rev. Alexander T. McGill, D.D., had received a majority of votes, and he was, thereupon, declared duly elected. The Rev. D. V. Maclean was elected temporary clerk. After the appointment of the usual standing committees, the Assembly assigned certain hours for hearing the reports of the several Boards of the church.

We propose to present a brief record of the more important decisions and acts of the Assembly.

Death of the Reverend Doctors Green and Matthews.

On the second day of the sessions of the Assembly, the Rev. Dr. Cuyler announced in an address replete with feeling, that he had just received the intelligence that the venerable Doctor Green had on the morning of that day expired at his residence in Philadelphia. Dr. Cuyler gave a brief sketch of the life and services of this venerable patriarch of the church, and concluded by moving the appointment of a committee to report to the General Assembly a minute in relation to the death of Dr. Green, and that the Assembly do now adjourn as a further mark of respect. This motion was adopted, and the committee subsequently

reported the following minute, which was approved and entered on the records of the Assembly—

“The decease of the Rev. Ashbel Green, DD. LL.D, of Philadelphia, at 6 o'clock, on Friday morning, the 19th of May, having been announced to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America, it was ordered that the following record be entered on their minutes, as expressive of their high esteem for his character, and of their gratitude to God for his long continued and eminently useful life, the greater part of which has been spent to the glory of God in the service of our beloved Church.

“Dr. Green was born at Hanover, in the state of New Jersey, on the 6th of July, in the year of our Lord 1762, so that he died far advanced in his eighty-sixth year. He was the son of the Rev. Jacob Green, the pastor of the Presbyterian church of that place.

“Of the events of his early life, we know little. He probably received the rudiments of his education from his father; and while it was in progress, he was, for a short time, actively engaged in the war of the American Revolution. He completed his literary course at Princeton College, New Jersey, during the presidency of the late Dr. Witherspoon. Not long afterwards he became successively a tutor and professor in the same institution. From this field of usefulness, he was called, in the winter of 1787, to the pastoral office in the second Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, as a colleague to the late Rev. James Sproat, D.D., whom he succeeded as sole pastor upon his demise in the autumn of 1793. His ordination took place in the month of May, 1787. In this relation he continued till he was called to the Presidency of the same college, in the autumn of the year 1812. This call he accepted, and he continued to discharge the important duties of that office till he resigned it, in the year 1822. He then returned to Philadelphia, where he resided till the time of his death.

“While the Congress of the United States, held its sessions in Philadelphia, Dr. Green and the late Bishop White, of Pennsylvania, officiated as its chaplains.

“Dr. Green was, for many years before his death, the only surviving member of the Convention which framed the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Ar-

dently attached to the doctrines and order of this Church, he not only firmly maintained her cause in trying times—and always in the spirit of the Master—but had the happiness of assisting until his death, and of witnessing the successful operation of the institutions of this Church, in whose inception he so largely participated, and the strength of her constitution to conduct and sustain her efficiently and triumphantly through the various important crises which have distinguished her career. He was also one of the Trustees of the General Assembly, having been for many years before his death, the only surviving member of the Board named in the charter, and continued to fulfil the office until his death.

“His time, after returning to reside in Philadelphia, was principally occupied in editing the *Christian Advocate*, which was, for several years the leading exponent of the faith and practice of the Presbyterian Church. Among its contents we find the first imprint of his lectures on the Shorter Catechism, since published in two duodecimo volumes by the Presbyterian Board of Publication—a work by which he may be fairly judged as a practical writer and an accomplished theologian. After he discontinued the publication of the *Christian Advocate*, he occupied himself, for some time, very laboriously, in preparing the works of Dr. Witherspoon for the press, together with an extended memoir of his life, and several of his works—neither of which have yet been published. He has also spent much time in revising his diary. These literary labours will constitute a valuable legacy to the Church he loved and served so well. After his return to Philadelphia, he never had a pastoral charge, although he frequently preached, and at one time statedly, in the First African Church, Philadelphia, for a year or two.

“He was, to a very late period of his life, a diligent and successful student. He also read much for his own edification. Among other devotional reading, he was wont to read a chapter in the Greek Testament in connexion with Scott’s practical remarks every day. His habits were eminently devotional. He spent hours daily in secret prayer and communion with God, in which he delighted; and to be deprived of the opportunity of which, evidently gave him pain.

“His decline was very gradual, and he suffered but little pain of body. Generally speaking, he enjoyed a calm and comforta-

ble frame of spirit, although he was not permitted to pass away without enduring some of the fiery darts of the adversary. Generally, however, he could appropriate the divine promises and enjoy the grace they contain, and find delight in prayer and praise. Being asked a few days before his departure, how the prospect before him appeared—"Glorious," was his prompt reply. Thus has he lived, honoured and useful, and died in Christian comfort, sleeping in Jesus. May his death be blessed to the Church which he loved.

"Resolved, That this General Assembly affectionately sympathize with his bereaved family; and that the stated clerk transmit an attested copy of this minute to them."

On the sixth day of the sessions of the Assembly, the death of the Rev. Dr. Matthews, of the New Albany Seminary, was announced by the Rev. Daniel Stewart, and a committee was appointed to prepare a minute expressive of the sense of the House of the greatness of the loss the church had sustained in the death of this excellent man. The minute reported and adopted in reference to this event, is as follows:

"The decease of the Rev. Dr. John Matthews, Professor of Theology in the New Albany Theological Seminary, in the seventy-seventh year of his age, which occurred on the evening of the 18th ult., having been announced to the General Assembly, a Committee was appointed to bring in a suitable minute. In accordance with this action, the following minute is respectfully submitted.

"The peculiar circumstances of Dr. Matthews' early history, give a deep interest to the distinction to which he afterwards attained as a preacher of the everlasting gospel, and an expounder and teacher of the doctrines of the Church. He was born in Guilford county, North Carolina, in the fall of 1771, where he devoted himself, until advanced to manhood, to a secular occupation, the evidences of which are yet to be seen. The pulpit of the old church in Orange county, where his mind was first turned to the subject of religion, is still pointed out as the handiwork of Dr. Matthews.

"His academical and theological studies were prosecuted under the direction of the well known Dr. Caldwell, of Guilford, North Carolina, and his license given him by the Presbytery of Orange, in the Month of March, 1801, at the age of twenty-nine years.

Until 1803, he travelled in Tennessee as a missionary, enduring many privations, when he was called to become the pastor of Nutbush and Grassy Creek churches, Granville county, North Carolina. In this situation he continued until 1806, when he removed to Martinsburg, Virginia, and thence to Shepherdstown, on the removal of Dr. Hoge to Hampden Sidney College.

"In this field of labour Dr. Matthews earned a most enviable reputation from the abundance and quality of his ministerial services. His preaching at the commencement of his career as a minister, was of a fervent, awakening description. This he afterwards exchanged for a more composed and didactic mode, characterized by great perspicuity and logical arrangement. There is reason to believe that his labours, about this time, were much blessed to the conviction and conversion of sinners.

"From this field of labour and usefulness, where he is yet held in grateful remembrance, he was called to fill the chair of Didactic Theology in the Theological Seminary, then located at South Hanover, Indiana, now at New Albany. In responding favourably to this call, there is evidence to believe that he was actuated by a disinterestedness which shrunk not from the prospect of future trials—'I am called by God,' said he to a near friend, who was expostulating with him against the acceptance of the invitation—'to an unpleasant mission, like Jonah, and if I do not go, I shall expect Jonah's punishment.' He left an affectionate people, whose affections he fully reciprocated, for a position in which he was called to endure privations until the close of his days. In the spirit of a true disciple, he went forth counting nothing dear to him, so that he might finish the work which was given him to do. Happy for the Church, if all her ministers were of like spirit.

"The same perspicuity which marked his preaching, the intellectual vigor which characterized his work, 'The Divine Purpose,' which has so often been studied with profit by the inquiring soul, were manifested in his duties as Professor. And though advanced to the age of seventy-seven, he continued with great vigour of mind, though in great feebleness of body, to attend on all the exercises of the Lecture-room. He continued to discharge all his duties as Professor until one week before his decease—when he who had so long and so implicitly listened to his Master's voice, as to his earthly abode, was summoned to his

mansion of rest on high. He rests from his labours, and his works do follow him.

"In connexion with this minute, the Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution, viz:

"*Resolved*, That we deeply sympathize with the bereaved family of the deceased, and that the Stated Clerk be directed to furnish them a copy of this action."

The right of church members to withdraw from the communion of the Church.

An overture from the presbytery of Montgomery, was presented, asking whether church sessions have the right, under the constitution, to allow members to withdraw from the communion of the church who are not guilty of any immoral conduct, and who do not manifest an intention to connect themselves with any other Church. The committee on Bills and Overtures, reported through their chairman, the Rev. Dr. Thornwell, that this question ought to be answered in the affirmative. This report was objected to, and an amendment offered that it be answered in the negative. This gave rise to an animated debate, and the previous question having been moved and seconded, the amendment was cut off, and the vote taken on the report of the committee, which recommended an affirmative answer, when said report was rejected by a decided majority. Of the debate on this subject we find the following report in the New York Observer.

"Rev. Dr. Humphrey, of Kentucky, moved to strike out the word *affirmative* and insert *negative*. He contended that there are three modes only by which a member could be separated from the church. 1. by regular trial, 2. by dismission to another body, and 3. by death. If any other way is recognised by the constitution, he should like to have it stated by the committee. The obligation which a man takes upon himself is a vow to God, and God only can absolve him from it. It is a fundamental principle of Protestantism, that while the church cannot be the *Lord* of the conscience, neither can it interfere to relieve the conscience of its responsibilities. The very nature of the relation makes it an affair with which the church may not interfere unless immorality shall render it necessary.

"Rev. Dr. Scovill agreed with these sentiments and although a member of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, he was

not present when the recommendation was made and he disapproved of it.

"Other members followed enforcing these views and illustrating the case by facts and examples.

"Rev. Dr. Thornwell. The point of the overture is entirely misapprehended. It is asked whether persons may withdraw from the Church who have been received unadvisedly, and are now satisfied that they are not converted persons, yet are regular in all their private and public duties. It is the custom of the church when members absent themselves from the communion, to visit them by committee. Suppose a member gives as a reason for staying away, 'I am satisfied that I am not a member of Christ, and when the pastor charged all those to retire who had not knowledge to discern the Lord's body, I was constrained in conscience to obey the command.' What is to be done? Will you discipline him? For what? For doing the very thing which you required him to do, and which if our principles are true, he was solemnly bound to do. What is the object of a trial? Is it not to ascertain whether a man is or not a member of Christ's body? But if he confesses that he is not, it is the best evidence that can be given, and the session may declare the fact to the church. It was the doctrine of Erastus that the church was the channel of grace, and had no right to excommunicate members for any cause. But this is not the doctrine of any Christian church at the present day. Now we hold that union with Christ is the basis of union with the church, and a credible profession simply declares the fact. Will any church session undertake to affirm that a man is and shall be a member of the church, when he tells them that he is not a member of Christ? Certainly not. It is now proposed that in such a case the session shall place him in the same position with the baptized children of the church, and not make him a heathen and publican.

"Another point. The Protestant church knows no man unless he is voluntarily subject to her authority: and the vow of subjection is binding no longer than he feels that he has a right to submit to them. The Roman Catholic view is that a man is every where bound by his vow to the church, and that once a virgin, bound by vow, always a virgin, once a monk always a monk. But with us the vow is not to the church, but to God, and he will be the judge. We propose no innovation, but the

assertion of a right that is inherent in our church, and ought to be distinctly set forth. Thus we shall separate the chaff from the wheat, purify the church, and publish the fact to the world.

"The church has been spoken of as a voluntary society, but there was this obvious feature: A voluntary society prescribes its own rules, but the church has its laws from its head: they are not to be altered or amended.

"Judge Hepburn compared the union of the church and members to the marriage relation, which is not to be dissolved at pleasure, and which should be protected with the most sacred care. He spoke with much energy against the recommendation of the committee.

"Dr. Lord said that if the new principle were adopted it would be a virtual declaration that absence from communion is no offence, and any man who wishes to get out of the church would simply stay away, and then withdraw. He urged that great evils would be introduced by making the door of exit so wide, and he begged the Assembly to pause before they sanctioned this doctrine.

"Dr. Thornwell replied to the analogy from the marriage contract by showing that the *invisible* church, the whole number of believers wherever found, in Presbyterian, Episcopal or Romish communions are the bride, the Lamb's wife, and no organization that may embrace believers and unbelievers is to be spoken of as in such union with the Saviour. He would have the church session take all possible means to ascertain whether such vital union subsists between any individual member and Christ, and if it did not exist, he would have the professed union dissolved."

The discussion was still further continued by Messrs. Ogden, Fraser, Platt, D. V. M'Lean, Webber and others.

"Rev. B. M. Smith of Virginia made an extended and able argument against the report of the Committee contending that abstaining from the Lord's table is a disciplinable offence, and a proper ground of exclusion from the church. So is professing Christ when not a Christian, and these truths ought to be held forth to the world. They would prevent hasty applications for admission into the church, and thus save the necessity of casting out. He would make the way out of the church the more difficult that unworthy persons might be deterred from coming in.

"Mr. Banks moved to postpone the whole subject indefinitely.

"Rev. Dr. Cuyler called for the previous question and it was ordered by the house.

"This brought the house to a direct vote upon the report of the Committee, and the motion to adopt their report was lost.

"So the Assembly decided against the right of sessions to allow church members to withdraw at their own pleasure, unless to go to some other church."

We should judge from this report that there was no essential difference between the parties to this debate; that Dr. Thornwell would not deny that a man's relation to the church cannot be dissolved at pleasure, and that the opponents of the report of the committee would not deny the justice of his remarks. The difference seems to lie in the use of terms. What is meant by withdrawing from the church? If it means simply abstaining from the communion table, then we see not how Dr. Thornwell's arguments are to be resisted. It is the duty of all who hear the gospel, to commemorate the death of Christ in the manner which he has appointed. Some, however, have not the qualifications which he has commanded his church to require in those whom she receives to the Lord's supper. Others are prevented by illness, by providential hindrances, or by scruples of conscience. Now if the question is whether a church member may absent himself from the Lord's supper, without justly subjecting himself to suspension or excommunication, we presume no one would be disposed to answer in the negative. He may be in a state of spiritual darkness; he may seriously doubt his own conversion: he may have erroneous views of the qualifications for that service. In all such cases he should be tenderly instructed, admonished, and borne with in all long-suffering and patience. But if he keeps aloof from this ordinance through indifference, or a worldly spirit, he is certainly deserving of censure, first of admonition, and if that prove ineffectual, of suspension. We should therefore be disposed to side with Dr. Thornwell in saying that there are cases in which a session would be fully justified in permitting a member to absent himself from the Lord's supper. But we would not call this withdrawing from the church. This mode of expression is derived from the congregational theory of the church, which makes the regenerate the materials and confederation the formal cause of a church. A covenant into which

certain believers enter into with each other, according to this doctrine, makes them a church. This is a voluntary compact and association, from which any man may withdraw, or from which he may be excluded. But according to the Presbyterian doctrine a man can no more withdraw from the church, than he can withdraw from the moral government of God. The church consists of all those who profess the true religion together with their children. Such children are baptized because they are church members. The only possible way in which they can cease to be members, is either by open apostacy, or excommunication. Suspension from church privileges is not exclusion from the church, but simply a refusal to allow the full benefits of church communion to certain persons for a season, just as a father may withhold from a disobedient son, the privileges of the family circle for a season without disowning him as a child. According to the Presbyterian theory of the church therefore, no man can withdraw from it. He cannot cease to profess the true religion, except by denying its doctrines, for which he should be cut off. He cannot free himself from the obligation of submitting to the discipline of the church, of communing with it, and of discharging all the duties of a church member, any more than he can free himself from the obligation of the moral law. If he neglects his duties, he should be dealt with for his disobedience; tenderly admonished, suspended, or excommunicated as the case may be. Being born within the church, or professing in baptism the true religion, he has incurred obligations and responsibilities from which he can never free himself, he has assumed a yoke which he can neither cast off, nor have removed by any human hand. The church is a voluntary society not in the sense that a man may enter and withdraw from it, at pleasure; but because no one can be forced to enter it, or coerced to remain in it. In the same sense obedience to the moral law must be voluntary. But it does not follow that because a man cannot lawfully be forced to profess the true religion, he may cease to make that profession without censure. While therefore we agree with the majority of the Assembly in saying no man can be allowed to withdraw from the church, we agree with Dr. Thornwell in thinking he may, in certain cases, be allowed to absent himself from the Lord's table, without incurring the sentence either of suspension or excommunication.

The case of the Rev. Dr. Skinner.

The Rev. John Skinner D.D., came to this country from Scotland, and was installed as pastor over the church in Lexington, Virginia. After having served that church about seven years, dissatisfaction with his preaching began to manifest itself among a portion of the people, and a certain number of them addressed him a letter apprizing him of the fact. Dr. Skinner then made a communication to the Presbytery tendering his resignation of his pastoral charge, with the view that Presbytery should institute an investigation into the state of the congregation. When the Presbytery met they heard Dr. Skinner, and the commissioners of the congregation, and dissolved the pastoral relation between him and the church in Lexington. From this decision, Dr. S. appealed and complained to the Synod of Virginia. The Synod decided that the appeal could not lie, as the decision from which it was taken was not of a judicial nature. The complaint they referred to the General Assembly. From the decision of the Synod refusing to entertain his appeal from the judgment of the Presbytery, Dr. Skinner appealed to the General Assembly. He subsequently published a pamphlet purporting to be a history of the proceedings of the Presbytery in his case. On this pamphlet the Presbytery founded certain charges, of which, after a protracted trial, he was pronounced guilty, and suspended from all the functions of the gospel ministry. From this decision of the Presbytery Dr. Skinner appealed immediately to the Assembly. He came before the house therefore, on three separate causes. 1. His appeal from the judgment of the Presbytery, by which he was pronounced guilty of certain charges and suspended from the ministry. 2. An appeal from the judgment of the Synod of Virginia, refusing to entertain his appeal from the previous decision of the Presbytery, dissolving his pastoral relation to the church in Lexington. 3. His complaint against the Presbytery for the said decision, which complaint was referred by the Synod to the Assembly. These causes were tried in the order here mentioned—

First, Dr. Skinner's appeal from the judgment of the Presbytery.

The following is the sentence pronounced against the accused by the Presbytery of Lexington. "The Rev. John Skinner, D.D., having, after a protracted and careful investigation of his

case, been declared guilty of three charges preferred against him, viz. 1. Libel and defamation; 2. Palpable misdemeanor and falsehood; 3. Manifestation of an unchristian spirit, therefore, from a sense of what is due to the church of the Lord Jesus Christ over which we are appointed to watch, *Resolved*, That the said Rev. John Skinner, D.D. be and he hereby is suspended from all the functions of the ministry of the gospel, until he make suitable confession of his sins, and give satisfactory evidence of repentance." After reading Dr. Skinner's appeal from this decision, and the records of the inferior judicatory, including all the testimony in the case, which occupied the greater part of the sessions of several days, the parties were fully heard, and then required, contrary to what we understood to be the usual practice of our church courts, literally to withdraw from the house. The roll having been called for the judgment of the members, the vote stood for sustaining the appeal 41; for sustaining in part 56; for not sustaining 66.

We see that some objection was made to this mode of taking the vote, it being supposed that the decision of the house should be expressed by saying simply sustain, or, not sustain. This objection appears to us unfounded. The Book expressly provides that "the decision may be either to confirm or reverse, in whole or in part, the decision of the inferior judicatory." How can this be done unless the members of the higher court are allowed to vote to sustain in whole or in part, as they see fit. Besides, the judgment of the lower court may cover many distinct charges, as in the present instance. Some members of the higher court may think that all have been proved, others that a part only have been sustained, and others that no one of them has been adequately established. It would do violence to the consciences of those, who considered that some only of the charges or specifications had been made good, to force them to vote either that all or none had been proved. The judgment of the presbytery was that Dr. Skinner was guilty of libel, defamation, palpable misdemeanor, falsehood, and the manifestation of an unchristian spirit. Those who voted to sustain that judgment declared him guilty on all these charges. How then could those who believed that he was guilty of some and not of others of these offences, vote that he was guilty of all? It would not only be a violence to the consciences of the judges, but a gross injus-

tice to the accused, to restrict the court to the simple question. sustain or not sustain. 'The question was not whether Dr. Skinner deserved suspension from the ministry; but whether he was guilty as charged. 'The question as to his suspension, was still an open question, after the calling of the roll was completed. 'Those who voted to sustain in part, had yet to express their judgment, whether the charges which they deemed sustained, were such as to justify suspension or not. In other words the calling of the roll was not to express the final judgment of the house, but to get the requisite light to frame that judgment. 'The committee appointed to bring in a minute expressive of such judgment, might have reported that enough had been proved to call for the continuance of the sentence of suspension: or they might report that the accused merited nothing beyond a solemn rebuke and admonition. They did bring in a minute to the latter effect, which was adopted by the house, and is in the following words, viz.—

"The appeal and complaint of the Rev. John Skinner, D.D. against the decision of the Presbytery of Lexington, is sustained, *pro forma*; the sentence of the Presbytery is reversed, and the appellant restored to all the functions of the ministry of the gospel.

"The complaint of the Rev. William Calhoun and others against the same Presbytery is dismissed.

"While the Assembly do fully restore the appellant to the functions of the of the ministry, and take pleasure in recording, that for about seven years he exhibited talents and zeal well adapted to edify the Church of God; and while they trust that he will hereafter show the same ability and fidelity in the Master's cause, they are constrained to express their deep concern at the uncharitable temper and litigiousness exhibited by him before the inferior judicatory; and their disapprobation of his course in printing and circulating his Lexington speech, pending his complaint to the Synod of Virginia.

"Wherefore, he is hereby solemnly admonished in relation to these matters, and warned carefully to avoid them in future.

"The Assembly regret, moreover, that they find no evidence that any of the parties have, at any stage of this unhappy controversy, resorted to the more private and fraternal methods of

making peace among brethren, which are suggested in the word of God.

“And the Assembly do now affectionately and solemnly enjoin on all concerned, to cultivate a spirit of charity and forgiveness, to study the things that make for peace, and to seek by importunate prayer, the influences of the Holy Spirit, that the wounds inflicted in the progress of this painful case may be healed, and the kingdom and glory of Christ may prevail in the region where these brethren are called to labour.”

This minute was adopted by a vote of ayes 87, nays 29. The moderator handed to the clerk a communication from the Rev. John Skinner, which had been put into his hands. The paper was read, and proved to be a representation touching the above minute charging him with an uncharitable spirit. The paper was unanimously directed to be returned to the writer without notice on the minutes.

Dr. Skinner's appeal from the decision of the Synod of Virginia.

This was an appeal from the decision of the Synod refusing to entertain Dr. Skinner's appeal from the decision of the Presbytery, dissolving his pastoral relation to the church in Lexington. After hearing the parties, viz., Dr. Skinner and the commissioners of the Synod, the vote was taken by calling the roll, for sustaining the appeal 42; for not sustaining 59. So the appeal was not sustained.

The accounts of the debate on this case published in the papers, are so brief, as to leave us at a loss as to the grounds of this decision. In one paper (New York Observer, June 10th). it is said, the Synod “refused to entertain the appeal, as the Presbytery had acted on his own request, and that of the people” in dissolving the pastoral relation between Dr. Skinner and the Lexington church. If this were the ground of the Synod's action, then the decision of the Assembly does nothing more than sanction the correctness of their judgment. It involves no constitutional principle. But in other places it is stated that the Synod refused to entertain the appeal in question, because the decision of the presbytery was an executive act, and not a judicial sentence. If this was the ground assumed by the Synod, then the action of the Assembly would seem to sanction the principle that no appeal can lie except in strictly judicial cases.

We presume this is the correct statement of the case, both from the drift of the reports in the newspapers, and from the fact that the former reason, though a very good one for refusing to sustain Dr. Skinner's appeal from the action of his presbytery, was no reason for refusing to entertain it.

Though this is so, we are slow to believe that the Assembly deliberately intended to sanction the doctrine that appeals are a remedy confined to strictly judicial cases. A member of the House informs us that several members who voted with the majority told him, that the only point they intended to decide by their vote was, that Dr. Skinner ought not to be restored to his relation as pastor of the Lexington church, that they did not mean to sanction the general principle as to appeals. We see also in the list of those who voted to sustain the action of the Synod, the names of brethren who we know do not hold, unless their opinions have been suddenly changed, the doctrine that appeals can lie only in judicial cases. We trust that this decision, made under such circumstances, may not be pleaded as authority for that doctrine. As this is a subject which has been repeatedly discussed in this journal, we shall not trouble our readers with any extended argument on it now. We beg leave merely to submit the following remarks—

It must be allowed to be a great evil when the action of the Assembly is inconstant and contradictory on important constitutional principles. Such inconsistency not only tends of necessity to impair confidence, but it is in itself a very serious evil. All courts are governed and should, to a great extent, be governed by precedent. Long established usage has the authority of law. People have the right to depend upon it. It works manifest injustice, when a party avails himself of a remedy, which a court for years and generations has recognised as appropriate, and he is suddenly and unexpectedly, by a new construction of the constitution, refused a hearing, because he has put his case in a wrong form. It is an undoubted fact that the highest judicatory of our church, in accordance with the uniform usage of other presbyterian churches, has for an hundred years, uniformly recognised the right of appeal in an aggrieved party, in any case whether judicial or executive. There is, as far as we know or believe, but one solitary decision of the Assembly to the contrary, and that preceded and followed by a multitude of cases of

an opposite character. It is still more humiliating and injurious when we see men who one year or in one judicatory, take ground that an appellant shall not be heard unless the case be strictly judicial, and in the following year and on other occasions quietly entertain such appeals without a whisper of disapprobation. The only way to avoid these evils, to maintain the dignity and authority of the Assembly, and to deal justly with those who appear at its bar, is to adhere rigidly to the established interpretation of the constitution.

But if this new construction is against all precedent, it is, as it seems to us, no less clearly against the express language and obvious interest of the constitution. "Every kind of decision," it is said, "which is formed in any church judicatory, except the highest, is subject to the review of superior judicatory, and may be carried before it in one or the other of the four following ways." This cannot mean, that one kind of decisions can be carried up in one way, and another kind in another: for it is admitted that every kind may be brought up by review of records, by reference, and by complaint: and, therefore, the passage must mean that the several remedies enumerated, are applicable to any and every kind of error or injustice. But in this enumeration appeals are included, and therefore as any kind of case can be carried up by review, reference, or complaint, so it can be by appeal. This is the plain meaning of the passage as it has ever been understood and acted upon.

In the third section of that chapter it is said, "An appeal is the removal of a cause already decided, from an inferior to a superior judicatory, by a party aggrieved." In the language of our Book *a cause* is a case, an act or decision of a court, about which diversity of opinion may exist, or in which different interests may be involved. Thus it is said in the next section, "Another method by which a cause which has been decided by an inferior judicatory, may be carried before a superior, is by complaint." Here *a cause* is any decision. This is admitted, for no one contends that complaints are limited to judicial matters. As then any decision or cause may be carried up by complaint, so also by appeal.

Again it is said, "The necessary operation of an appeal is, to suspend all further proceedings on the ground of the sentence appealed from. But if a sentence of suspension, or excommuni-

cation from church privileges, or of deposition from office be the sentence appealed from, it shall be considered as in force until the appeal shall be issued." The plain meaning of this is, that an appeal suspends the operation of the decision appealed from, *except in judicial cases*. Suspension, excommunication and deposition are all the judicial sentences known to our constitution, unless mere admonition be added, which last, from its nature, does not admit of being suspended, for the vote to admonish is the admonition itself. Here then the constitution expressly and most justly provides that an appeal suspends the operation of a decision, except in judicial cases, and therefore by necessary implication, admits that there are other than judicial sentences from which an appeal may properly be taken.

Our Book makes two and only two distinctions as to complaints and appeals. The one relates to the persons entitled to avail themselves of these remedies, the other to their operation. Any one can complain of the decision of a church court who thinks that decision is unconstitutional or injurious. It is the right of any member of the judicatory or of the church, to see that an evil, as he deems it, may be examined into and redressed. But no one can appeal but "an aggrieved party." If he does not see fit to arrest the operation of the decision, no other person has the right to interfere and prevent the will of the judicatory taking effect. An appeal, therefore, differs from a complaint, in being a remedy confined to those who consider themselves aggrieved or injured by the decision of the lower court. It differs also from a complaint inasmuch as the latter does not suspend the operation of the decision complained of. When however our Book says, That "every kind of decision" can be carried up from a lower to a higher court, by appeal, it does not mean every decision, but what it says, "*every kind of decision*," because the interests of parties may be most deeply implicated by every kind of act of a church court, executive, legislative, or judicial. Appeals, from their nature, are confined to cases of real or supposed grievance.

This suggests the main reason after all for insisting on this right of appeal. It is essential to our system. Neither ministers nor church members will ever submit to give it up, and put themselves entirely in the power of a session or presbytery. The denial of the right is an arbitrary stretch of power. There

are innumerable cases in which a complaint would afford no redress. The evil is consummated before the remedy can be applied. Suppose, for example, a presbytery should decide that a congregation should be divided, and the people, or a portion of them, feel aggrieved by the decision, what good would it do them to complain? The sentence would take effect; two churches would be constituted and organized, and might both have pastors, before the synod could hear the complaint. It would be a mockery to tell such people, after the evil was all done, they might complain about it. They have no redress, unless by appeal they can arrest the decision, until the higher courts have decided on its wisdom or justice. The same remarks apply to other cases. A presbytery may dissolve the pastoral relation between a pastor and his people; the people may consider themselves deeply aggrieved. If they cannot appeal there is no remedy. Their pastor is gone, installed over another church, before their complaint comes to be heard. Or the pastor may be the aggrieved party, but if he can only complain, his place may be supplied by another pastor, before a final decision is had on the question whether he is to be removed or not. How unreasonable and unjust is this. A sentence is allowed to take full effect, before the competent authorities have decided whether it shall have any effect at all. We are persuaded the churches will never give up the right of appeal; the right of arresting the operation of decisions which they regard as disastrous or unjust, until the court of the last resort has given its judgment. It is a primary principle of justice that no sentence should take effect, until all who have a right to sit in judgment in the case, have decided that it shall be carried out. This is "the necessary effect of an appeal," says our Book. It is the righteous provision of our standards that an injury shall not be inflicted, before it be finally determined that it is unavoidable or deserved. The exceptions made as to the application of this principle in judicial cases, is plainly a sacrifice of the individual to the whole—it is better that one person should suffer for a while under an unrighteous sentence, than that the whole church should be disgraced and injured by an unworthy member or minister, until an appeal can be carried through all our courts. The fact is that so far from appeals being confined to judicial cases, those are precisely the cases where they are of the least

importance. They have in such cases no advantage over a complaint—they do not arrest the operation of the sentence, and they do not bring it more effectually under the review of the higher court.

There is another remark we cannot refrain from making. The action of the Assembly in this case involves a contradiction. They decide that an appeal cannot lie in a particular case, while in the very act of entertaining such an appeal. If the Synod were right in refusing to entertain Dr. Skinner's appeal from the Presbytery, how could the Assembly entertain his appeal from the Synod? If the case was not a judicial one before the Synod, it was not a judicial one before the Assembly. It could not change its character by passing from one court to the other. The only consistent course for the Assembly, would have been, the moment the appeal was reported, to refuse to hear it, because the decision against which it was entered was not a judicial sentence. This was what the Synod did. But instead of this, the Assembly gravely entertain an appeal from a non-judicial decision of the Synod, resolve themselves into a court, hear the parties, deliver as their judgment that they have no right to do what with so much solemnity they are actually engaged in. They say appeals are confined to judicial cases, while engaged in trying one from an executive decision. So deeply wrought into the consciousness of the church, is the conviction that the right of appeal is a right sacred to every aggrieved party, no matter under what form the grievance may be inflicted. If Dr. Skinner had no right to appeal from the decision of the Presbytery, he had no right to appeal from a similar decision of the Synod, and the Assembly in hearing his appeal from the latter, contradict their own decision that the Synod did right in refusing to hear him as an appellant from the Presbytery.

Some of the special advocates of liberty of speech and opinion, are apt, when in the majority, to find out that it is very heinous to express any dissent from the decision of the General Assembly. This is not Protestantism; nor is it Christianity. It is perfectly consistent with all due deference and obedience, for any member of the church to express without reserve his opinions as to the wisdom or justice of any decision of our ecclesiastical courts. Least of all can the exercise of this right be dis-

puted, when the decision in question is opposed to the established usage of the church, and the previous decisions of almost every Assembly since the first organization of that body. We do not however believe that the Assembly, whatever may be the legal import of their decision, consciously intended to sanction the new doctrine on appeals; we believe they simply meant to say that Dr. Skinner ought not to be restored to the pastoral office over the church in Lexington. A decision, we presume, in which all parties concur.

Dr. Skinner's Complaint.

This case came up by reference from the Synod of Virginia, to whom the Rev. Dr. Skinner had complained of a decision of the Presbytery of Lexington, dissolving his pastoral relation.

The complaint of Dr. Skinner, the decision of the Presbytery, and the records in the case were then read, and the Assembly proceeded to hear the parties. The parties having been heard, the roll was called for opinions and votes. The Rev. Dr. Krebs offered the following resolution as a minute expressive of the judgment of the house, which was adopted; yeas 65. nays 25.

Resolved, That had the Presbytery of Lexington been requested, *simpliciter*, to visit the Church of Lexington, in the preliminary stages of this business, for the purpose of investigating the state of things, which, according to the allegation of Dr. Skinner, induced him to ask leave to resign his pastoral charge, or had the Presbytery, in view of that allegation, proceeded of their own motion to make such investigation, those things which seem to have produced the great excitement which manifestly existed in this case, might not have occurred—nevertheless, in view of the actual state of the case, as it appeared to the Presbytery, in the last stages of it, the Presbytery could do no otherwise than to agree to the dissolution of the pastoral relation, and that their final decision in the premises be, and it is hereby sustained.

“Rev. Dr. Thornwell gave notice of a dissent for himself and others, from the above minute. He went for sustaining the Presbytery to the fullest extent, and he had therefore, voted in the negative, in order to be able to enter his dissent.

“Rev. Mr. Webster entered his dissent to the decision in the case of Dr. Skinner. He asked that it be entered on the pro-

ceedings of Assembly, but, after some discussion, this was refused, and it was ordered to be filed. He then presented a protest against the decision keeping his dissent from the proceedings, which was ordered to be entered.

"The Rev. James Lillie and others entered their protest against the decision in the case of Dr. Skinner, for the following reasons:

"First, Dr. Skinner, did not resign his pastoral charge.

"Second, Dr. Skinner did positively, and in the most solemn manner, protest against being regarded as having resigned.

"Third, Dr. Skinner's separation, therefore, from the Lexington church, was an ejection from his charge. And

"Fourth, consequently a very severe sentence was carried into effect against a minister of the highest reputation, unaccused, untried, and uncondemned.

JAMES LILLIE,
G. T. SNOWDEN,
C. C. CUYLER,
R. TAYLOR,

JOSEPH F. FENTON,
JAMES BLACK,
JOHN P. VANDYKE,
WM. A. GRAY.

"The following dissent was offered, and admitted to record, viz:

"We the undersigned, beg leave to record our dissent from the minute adopted in the case of Dr. Skinner's complaint against the Presbytery of Lexington. We believe that the conduct of the Presbytery, complained of, was constitutional and wise, and that the Presbytery adopted the only course which could be adopted, to promote the interests of that congregation. The language of the minute seems to us to evade the main point in dispute.

DAVID STERRETT,
M. D. FRASER,
DANIEL MACK,
G. MANWARING,
GEO. DAVIDSON,
J. H. THORNWELL,

J. S. BERRYMAN,
BENJAMIN OGDEN,
HENRY L. DOOLITTLE,
JOHN H. TOWNLEY,
J. A. LANCASTER, JR.,
SAMUEL MAHAFFEY,

Appeal of John Cathey.

This was an appeal from a decision of the Synod of North Carolina, sustaining the action of the Presbytery of Concord, and of the session of the Paw Creek Church, by which he, the

said John Cathey, was suspended from the communion of the church, for marrying the sister of his deceased wife. The Rev. Dr. Krebs was appointed to act in behalf of the appellant in his absence. The papers having been read, and the parties heard, the roll was called, and 51 voted for not sustaining the appeal, 26 for sustaining it, and 3 *non liquet*. So the appeal was dismissed.

Overture on Temperance.

The committee of Bills and Overtures reported the following paper, viz:

"A preamble and resolution submitted by the Executive Committee of the American Temperance Union to the General Assembly for its adoption, to which may be added an Address of the New York City Temperance Society, organized on Christian principles, transmitted to the Assembly by a Committee of the Society.

"The Committee would recommend, in reference to this whole subject of Temperance Societies, and all other secular institutions for moral ends, the adoption of the following minute:

"The Church of Jesus Christ is a spiritual body, to which have been given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world. It is the great instrumentality of the Saviour, through which, by his eternal Spirit, he dispenses salvation to the objects of his love. Its ends are holiness and life, to the manifestation of the riches and glory of Divine grace, and not simply morality, decency, and good order, which may to some extent be secured without faith in the Redeemer, or the transforming efficacy of the Holy Spirit. The laws of the Church are the authoritative injunctions of Christ, and not the covenants, however benevolent in their origin and aim, which men have instituted of their own will; and the only ground of obligation which the Church *as such* inculcates, is the authority of God speaking in His word, and not pledges of honour which create, measure, and define the peculiar duties of all voluntary associations. In this kingdom of God the holy scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners, and no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws which shall bind the conscience, or to issue recommendations which shall regulate manners without the war-

rant, explicit or implied, of the revealed will of God. It is hence beside the province of the Church to render its Courts, which God ordained for spiritual purposes, subsidiary to the schemes of any associations founded in the human will, and liable to all its changes and caprices. No Court of Christ can exact of His people to unite with the Temperance, Moral Reform, Colonization, or any other society which may seek their aid. Connexion with such institutions is a matter of Christian liberty. Their objects may be, in every respect, worthy of the countenance and support of all good men; but in so far as they are moral and essentially obligatory, the Church promotes them among its own members—and to none others does its jurisdiction extend—by the means which God has ordained for the edification of his children. Still, in the exercise of their Christian liberty, as good citizens, as patriotic subjects of the State, from motives of philanthropy, and from love to God, Christian people may choose to adopt this particular mode of attempting to achieve the good at which all moral societies profess to aim. They have a right to do so, and the Church, as long as they endorse no false principles and countenance no wrong practices, cannot interfere with them. Recognizing these propositions as the truths of the word of God, this General Assembly, as a Court of Jesus Christ, cannot league itself with any voluntary society, cannot exact of those who are subject to its discipline to do so, but must leave the whole matter—where the scriptures leave it—to the prudence, philanthropy, and good sense of God's children, each man having a right to do as to him shall seem good. These societies must appeal not to Church Courts, but to church members. When they proclaim principles that are scriptural and sound, it is not denied that the Church has a right, and under certain circumstances may be bound to bear testimony in their favour; and when, on the other hand, they inculcate doctrines which are infidel, heretical, and dangerous, the Church has a right to condemn them. In conformity with these statements, the General Assembly has no hesitation in cordially approving of abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a matter of Christian expediency. According to the words of the Apostle, in *Rom. xiv. 21*: 'It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak;' and in expressing its affectionate interest

in the cause of Temperance—and would recommend to its ministers and elders, who have become connected with Temperance Societies, to use every effort to prevent the introduction of any other principle as the ground of their pledge, and to throw around these institutions those safeguards which shall be the means of rescuing them from the excesses, to which they are liable from influences opposed to, or aside from the gospel of Christ.

“After the reading of the above Report, on motion of the Rev. Dr. Krebs, it was unanimously adopted.”

Report of the Board of Foreign Missions.

The report of the Board having been presented the following resolutions were offered and adopted, viz:

“*Resolved*, That in the Report of the Board of the General Assembly, we see much cause for thanksgiving and gratitude to God, for the wide field of usefulness opened to the Church, for the encouraging state of the different missions among the heathens, as seen in the increase of Church members, in the healthful state of the mission schools, in the efficiency of the printing presses, and of the facilities afforded of thus preaching the everlasting gospel publicly, and from house to house. And they would take encouragement, that in the enlargement and advance of the missionary work, the increase of the receipts has sustained the increased expenditures of the year.

“*Resolved*, That in the midst of so much that is encouraging, there is cause of deep humiliation in the sight of God, that so many of our members and ministers manifest so little interest in the state of the benighted heathen; and the General Assembly, whilst they reprove such indifference to this great duty, must affectionately exhort the churches, and every individual member, to unite as one man in sending to the destitute the knowledge of the Saviour's name.

“*Resolved*, That in the early death, by the hands of violent men, of one of their highly esteemed and useful missionaries, in a field comprehending one-third of the inhabitants of the globe, while engaged in his Master's work, the General Assembly would view the hand of God; and whilst they would humbly submit to this mysterious and distressing providence, they would hear the voice of God speaking to the Church in rebuke, for past

unfaithfulness in the great work of sending the gospel to the perishing heathen.

"Resolved, That the General Assembly would ever recognize the insufficiency of all human agency, apart from the blessing of the Holy Ghost, and they would affectionately exhort the whole Church to be much engaged in prayer to God for his blessing on the labours of all his servants, at home and abroad, and that all his professing people may have much of the spirit that was in Christ.

"Resolved, That all our churches be most earnestly exhorted to attend to the monthly concert and collection, and that, if practicable, the collections be taken on the Sabbath.

"Resolved, That the Report of the Board be approved, and referred to the Executive Committee for publication."

These resolutions were ably advocated by Dr. Cuyler, Dr. Thornwell, and Messrs. Wilson of Northern India, and Ramsay, of the Choctaw mission. Walter Lowrie, Esq., secretary of the Board, gave very interesting details concerning the operations of the Board and the condition of the several stations. The amount received during the last year, together with the balance on hand, was \$108,756 71; the expenditures have been \$109,186 66. The receipts for the last year exceeded those for the year preceding by \$13,000.

The following preamble and resolution were then offered by the Rev. John C. Lord, D.D. as an addition to the foregoing, when the whole were adopted unanimously:

"Whereas, In the divine Providence, an effectual door for the propagation of the gospel in France, is now opened by the recent revolution in that great State, while the monetary embarrassments resulting from the political convulsions in Europe, have seriously crippled the resources and the efforts of the Evangelical Societies who are engaged in the work of circulating the scriptures, and disseminating the gospel in that country, therefore

"Resolved, By the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, that it be recommended to all congregations in our connexion, to take up a collection on the 3d Sabbath in June next, or as soon thereafter as may be convenient, to be paid over to the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions, for the purpose of aiding in the work of evangelizing France."

Board of Domestic Missions.

The report of the committee on the statement of the Board of Domestic Missions, was then taken up, and adopted. It is as follows:

"The committee to whom was reported the report of the Board of Domestic Missions, report that they have examined the same, and recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.

"1. That this report be adopted, and published under the directions of the Board, and that the Board furnish the stated clerk of the Assembly with an abstract to be published in the Appendix of the Minutes.

"2. That in view of the unusual prosperity of the Board during the present year, the General Assembly do express their gratitude to the great Head of the Church, for his blessing on a cause so precious, and so deeply interesting to his people.

"3. That in view of the magnitude of the work, the immense field to be occupied, and the vast importance of the cause, advancing with the rapid increase of the population of our country, we earnestly exhort the churches under our care, to make this cause the subject of special prayer.

"4. That it be earnestly recommended to the churches to make annual collections for the Board of Domestic Missions, and that the Synods, and Presbyteries do adopt such means, as in their judgment may best secure this object.

"5. That it be recommended to all the churches under the care of this Assembly to aid in the work of Church Extension, and that annual collections be made for this object, distinct from that of Domestic Missions. Whilst we rejoice that this work is advancing, we express our regret that so many of our churches have failed to co-operate in it.

"6. That in the present state of the work of the religious instruction of the coloured population in the southern states, and its prospects, there is much that is gratifying and encouraging; and the Assembly expresses the conviction that this important work calls for increasing attention, and a more enlarged effort.

"7. That in view of the vast importance of Domestic Missions, a sermon be delivered on this subject during the sessions of each Assembly, by some one previously appointed by this body.

That part of the above report, relative to church extension par-

ticularly, was advocated by Dr. Cuyler, the Rev. Mr. Frazer, of Illinois, and the Rev. Mr. Stewart, of Philadelphia.

Rev. Mr. Bishop moved as an addition to the report, that the Board of Domestic Missions and the agency at Louisville, be removed to Pittsburg, and the business hereafter be transacted there.

A proposition to postpone it indefinitely being made, Mr. Brownson hoped, if the Assembly were not ready to act upon it, that it might be only postponed, as the Assembly meet next year in Pittsburg, and they could then see for themselves. He gave his reasons in favour of the removal.

Rev. Dr. Harding conceived there would be just as much reason to remove the Foreign Board to India as the Domestic Board to Pittsburg, so far as the argument of greater efficiency was concerned.

Rev. Dr. McDowell, Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, by permission, addressed the Assembly, giving his reasons why there should be no removal. He believed the operations could be carried on with more efficiency at the East—and the natural consequence of removal would be to create a separate organization for the East.

Several other gentlemen spoke to the same effect, and the resolution was indefinitely postponed.

Rev. Dr. Scovel proposed a resolution to appoint a western agent to forward the business of Church extension, which was referred to the Board of Domestic Missions.

Board of Education.

The Committee on the report of the Board of Education, made a report, which was amended, adopted, and is as follows, viz.

“The committee to whom was referred the report of the Board of Education, beg leave to submit the following resolutions, viz.

“1. *Resolved*, That this General Assembly, believing that the children of the Church are a trust committed to the Church by the Lord Jesus Christ, and having confidence in the power of Christian Education, to train them, with the divine blessing, ‘in the way they should go,’ do cordially recommend their congregations to establish primary and other schools, as far as may be

practicable, on the plan sanctioned by the last Assembly—of teaching the truths and duties of our holy religion in connexion with the usual branches of secular learning.

"2. *Resolved*. That this Assembly heartily approve of the plan of establishing academies or schools, male and female, under the supervision of the Presbyteries, for the purpose of securing a thorough education, religious and secular, to those of their youth who may desire to pursue branches of knowledge not taught in the sessional schools.

"3. *Resolved*, That colleges, as an integral part, and in their wide-spread relations to the best interests of society, a vitally important part of a complete system of Christian education, demand the fostering care of the Church; and that the Board of Education be and hereby is authorised to assist in the promotion of the cause of collegiate education, by means of any funds that may be given for that purpose.

"4. *Resolved*, That inasmuch as one (or more) of the Theological Seminaries of the Church, during the temporary interval of its endowment, is in a condition that needs assistance, the Board of Education be and hereby is, authorised to apply such funds as may be appropriated by the donors to advance the interests of theological education.

"5. *Resolved*, That in view of the decrease in the number of candidates for the ministry, which has occurred during the year, according to the statistics furnished to the Assembly, the Church is called upon to continue zealously the use of all proper means, that are adapted to waken the attention of her whole communion to the duty enjoined by the Saviour, of preaching the gospel to every creature; and especially that prayer to the Lord of the harvest, to send forth laborers into his harvest, should ascend with more fidelity and constancy from the closet, the family altar and the sanctuary.

"6. *Resolved*, That for the purpose of invoking, in a special manner, the blessing of God upon the measures for the Christian education of the rising generation, which are in progress throughout our Church, under the recent action of the Assembly, and also for the purpose of uniting our common supplications in behalf of an increase of faithful laborers in the field of the world, it be recommended to our churches to observe the first Sabbath of November next, as a day of special prayer; and it is further

recommended, that our ministers preach on that day, on some topic connected with the consecration and religious education of the children of the church.

"7. *Resolved*, That it be enjoined upon the Presbyteries to use great vigilance in the examination of all who present themselves as candidates for the ministry, especially in cases where there has been a deficiency of early Christian education; and that the Presbyteries are solemnly urged to continue a strict and affectionate supervision over their candidates during the entire course of their preparatory studies for the ministry.

"8. *Resolved*, That it be enjoined upon the Synod to appoint a Synodical agent in behalf of the cause of education, whose duty it shall be to confer with similar Presbyterial agents, and co-operate with the Board in having this important cause more fully presented to all our churches.

"9. *Resolved*, That the Annual Report be committed to the Board for publication."

Board of Publication.

The committee on the Report of the Board of Publication made a report, which was amended, adopted, and is as follows, viz :

"The committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Publication, having examined the same, together with an exhibition of the plans and operations of the Board, would recommend for the adoption of the General Assembly the following resolutions, viz :

"1st. *Resolved*, That the object of this Board—to furnish for the churches under our care, in cheap and substantial form, well selected books, sound in theology, and rich in practical and devotional matter, is one so important, that it cannot be neglected without great loss to the Church and the world.

"2d. That while we recommend that special care be taken to accommodate the distant and more feeble parts of the Church, the cautious manner in which the funds of the Board have been managed, meets the cordial approbation of the Assembly.

"3d. That it be recommended to the Board to publish translations of other works of a doctrinal and devotional character in the German language.

"4th. That it earnestly recommend to the Synods and Pres-

byteries that have not already acted in this matter, speedily to establish depositories, and by an efficient system of colportage, under their own direction, to aid the Board in securing a wide circulation for their books.

"5th. That every friend of truth and godliness be entreated to aid the Board in establishing a fund for Agency and Colportage—a fund for supplying the West with books—for aiding Foreign Missions in this department—for supplying needy ministers, churches, and Sabbath schools with libraries—and also a fund for reducing the price of particular books by stereotyping or otherwise."

Report on the Finances of the Board.

The General Assembly in 1847 appointed a committee to examine into the manner in which the several Boards were conducted, and to enquire whether due regard to economy was had in their modes of operations. Dr. Plumer, the chairman of that committee, performed the duty assigned him, in a thorough manner, and presented an elaborate report, approving of the mode in which the Boards conducted their operations. This report was referred to a committee of which Judge Hepburn was the chairman, who subsequently brought in a report recommending various retrenchments, such as reducing the number of offices, lowering salaries, abolishing travelling expenses, &c.

Judge Hepburn said, in support of his report, that he was not hostile to the Boards; but he thought they needed reformation. For example, the *Board of Publication* ought not to have both an editor and a publishing agent. He thought that the Executive Committee ought to do the work of editing. This would save annually the salary of editor, which was \$1200. As to the *Board of Education*, he thought that its two agencies ought to be both abolished, as there was no good gained by them. Besides, he had two charges against the General Agent, which were sufficient for his removal. One was, that he had insisted upon offering a salary of \$200 to a western agent, and had said by way of argument, that the opinion of the Board in regard to his receiving it was like that of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. The other charge was, that the General Agent, or the Board, had added to the travelling expenses of one agent for the purpose of concealing the large amount which belonged to

another; for it appeared that one agent, whose travelling expenses were \$16.75, was put down as expending \$100.12½. He had, also, known a case where an agent visited one church on Saturday, returned home on Monday, and then went back to another church in the same neighbourhood on the next Saturday. As to the *Board of Domestic Missions*, why should the Corresponding Secretary have so large a salary? Moreover, in the west, the expenses of the agents were not so much as those of the east. This showed either that the western agents did not travel enough, or that those in the east were very prodigal of the Church's money. Why these disproportions? He believed that all these travelling expenses ought to be done away with altogether. They were unknown any where else except in the Church. As to the *Foreign Board*, some of their expenses were unreasonably high. One of their agents had a larger salary than the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, and yet had large travelling expenses paid besides. In short, he thought a reformation was necessary.

The question first came up on consolidating the offices of Editor and of Publishing Agent in the *Board of Publication*.

Dr. Krebs thought these two offices should not, and could not, be united. The Executive Committee could never attend to the selection and editing of books, without the aid of an Editor. This last office was one that could not possibly be dispensed with. The pastors on that committee could not attend to this work, in the midst of their other avocations.

Dr. Lord, of Buffalo, said that our Boards were the representatives of the Church principle in conducting benevolent operations, and he hoped they would be models of economy. But we must be careful not to agitate these matters in an ill-advised way. He agreed with Dr. Krebs on the particular point in question.

Dr. Cuyler said, the consolidation of these two distinct offices was an impracticability.

A motion was made that a committee be appointed to report on this whole subject to the next Assembly.

Walter Lowrie, Esq., hoped that this would not be the course adopted. The report from the committee contained distinct charges of extravagance, as well as undefined charges of the same kind. An attempt had been made to sustain these charges in a speech of some bitterness for such an Assembly. It was due

therefore to the best interests of the church, and to the individuals concerned, that the General Assembly hear and decide this matter. Let us look at the history of this investigation. Last year on the last day of the session, and as the minutes show, the very last thing that was done, a resolution was offered and adopted to examine into the pecuniary state of the Boards. With such haste and looseness was the resolution adopted, that only the chairman could be ascertained, the others were merely called Mr. A. and Mr. B., and to this hour it is not known who they were. The chairman, Dr. Plumer, took up the investigation, called on the several Boards, and left a series of interrogatories, which were all fully answered. From those answers he had submitted to the Assembly an able and full report. It has been read to the house, and not being satisfactory to Judge Hepburn, the latter gentleman moved to have it referred to a committee. That committee has made its report, and a speech has been made in its support. Now the motion is to refer that report and the whole subject to the next Assembly. To this Mr. Lowrie seriously objected. If the waste and extravagance charged exist, let the Assembly so decide, and let the unfaithful men be discharged and others put in their places. If these charges have no foundation, then let that fact be known. It is due to individuals and to the church that unfounded charges be not hung up for a whole year. If these matters are postponed now it will be unjust to the officers of the Boards. In that case, he added, it is not for me to say what they may deem it their duty to do, but certainly if they do not possess the confidence of the churches, the sooner they leave your service the better.

The motion for the appointment of a committee to report to the next Assembly was then withdrawn. JUDGE HEPBURN arose and said he was satisfied that his suggestion about the Board of Publication, ought not to be adopted, and requested leave to withdraw it, which being unanimously granted, he added that his principal objection to the Boards was the allowance of travelling expenses to their agents.

The question now coming up in reference to the recommendations of the report relating to the Board of Education, Dr. Van Rensselaer, the corresponding secretary of that Board, on motion addressed the house, as follows:

“He said that so far as the Board of Education was concerned

the recommendation of the committee was very different from a question about travelling expenses. It proposed to abolish all their agencies. It, therefore, struck directly at the very foundation of all their principles of administration. The Chairman had brought two charges against the General Agent. As to his having insisted that a Western agent should take a salary, the offer was made under peculiar circumstances. The Western agent was doing a laborious work for the Board, in visiting the churches of the Synods of Wheeling and Pittsburgh; and besides, had an academy, where one or two young men under the care of the church were receiving their education gratuitously. While on his agency, he hired a teacher to assist him at the academy. He could ill afford to make these sacrifices; and the Board could not in justice and decency ask him to do so. Under these circumstances, the General Agent was right in urging his brother to accept the salary proffered by the Board. The remark about the laws of the Medes and Persians was a playful one; but the Board acted in this case under a law far more authoritative than that of the Medes and Persians—a law which declared that ‘the labourer was worthy of his hire;’ and ‘thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.’ As to the other charge, of falsifying the accounts about travelling expenses, the General Agent had no more to do with it than the man in the moon. It was a mere mistake of the clerk of the office, who was suddenly called upon to make out the statement, and who had to search into the pecuniary matters of two agents, whose accounts were mixed up together, they having co-operated in the same field. When the error was pointed out, the unintentional injustice to one of these respected brethren was immediately corrected, and explained to his entire satisfaction. And yet these two charges are here publicly thrown out against the General Agent, one of them involving deep moral turpitude, when both of them could have been explained, if the chairman had requested an explanation from any one connected with the Board. Sir, did you ever hear of an investigating committee in Congress, or elsewhere, proposing the most serious charges and changes, without ever having called before them the heads, or clerks, in the offices? This mode of proceeding was not only unjust to the Board; it was unjust to the church, to the General Assembly, and to all parties concerned.

“As to doing away with agents, the Secretary said *we must*

have executive officers. The resolutions of Synods and Presbyteries were generally of little account. They would indeed assist the Board sometimes very much; but without agents, the churches did not generally show a disposition to take up collections. To be sure, agents could not visit all the churches; but they could visit a great many, and could make arrangements with voluntary agents to visit others. The experience of other benevolent institutions, as well as our own, proved that a wise system of agency was attended by the most beneficial results. If the Presbyterian Church should adopt the Scotch plan, and assign particular Sabbaths for the different benevolent objects, and enjoin upon the inferior judicatories to carry on their operations in this systematic way, perhaps after a time we might dispense with agents. But this committee propose to abolish our agencies, and yet they give us no substitute. The Board of Education, moreover, required agents as much, and perhaps more, than any other Board; because the community were in various quarters prejudiced against it, and needed instruction on education topics, and because the young men under their care needed to be visited. Especially at this time was it unwise to think of destroying our agencies, when the Board were just commencing to carry forward the system of Parochial schools. This whole work, so vastly important, would be endangered by introducing any radical change in the present mode of conducting our operations.

“In regard to the second point, which was the *economy of administration*, the subject of *salaries* was made prominent in the committee’s report. The Secretary said that he should not have uttered one word on this subject, if there were not particular circumstances which demanded it. For himself, he had no personal interest whatever in the matter. He did not want any salary, and his intimate friends knew that he was opposed to receiving any. He finally consented to take it as a trust, and to expend it in advancing the interests of education, and of the church. He was induced to take it, because its refusal would be placing his fellow-labourers in an unfair position, especially the individual who should succeed him; and because it would be acting upon the principle that a man’s salary ought to be lowered, or abolished, in proportion to his private property. Besides, taking it would be a stimulant to his own sense of personal responsibility. There were three principles in regard to salaries which he thought were

reasonable. 1. Salaries of the officers of the Boards should be in proportion to those of ministers in the place where the offices are located. 2. They should fairly remunerate the officers. 3. They should bear a proportion to what the same men could reasonably expect in doing other service in the church or community. Although the present salaries are a fair compensation, yet they are not equal to what some of these officers received in the places from which they were called. Mr. Lowrie of the Foreign Board, received as Secretary of the United States Senate, the sum of \$3000, and the Board originally offered him this same salary to take charge of their affairs, but he declined receiving more than \$2000, which the other Boards were giving at that time. Dr. McDowell was receiving \$2500, as pastor of a church in Charleston, S. C., when he was called to his present office at a salary of \$2000.

"As to *travelling expenses*, the committee propose to abolish them entirely, and as a reason for it, the chairman says, that he is not aware that such an allowance exists 'in any other organization than that of the church.' This, sir, is an astonishing statement. Does not Congress pay for the travelling expenses of their members, and pay liberally? Do not many of the state legislatures do the same? Does not every merchant, who sends his clerks to any place to do his business, do the same? Are not witnesses paid to attend a court? Does not our General Assembly pay the travelling expenses of its members? It has been said, indeed, that the judges in some states do not receive travelling expenses on their circuits; but these judges do not travel as *far* or as *constantly* as agents;* and besides they have their profession as counsellors to rely upon; and, moreover, few will doubt that they ought to be paid better than they are. The committee seem to think that the payment of travelling expenses is a temptation to travel too much. There is no foundation for the idea. The temptation is all the other way. It a great self-denial for an agent to leave his home a great part of every year, and to endure the self-denials of an arduous and ungracious service. If a man's principle is ever severely exercised, it is when he must be con-

* It came out in the course of the debate that the Judges in Pennsylvania, to whom reference was made, did receive in the form of a *per diem* allowance, in addition to their salaries three or four times as much as the agents of the Board received for their travelling expenses.

tinually "*on the go*," from week to week. Those who think agents have easy times, have no adequate conception of the nature and duties of the office. As for himself, he had never taken anything for travelling expenses, for reasons which were satisfactory to himself; and he therefor spoke with the more freedom on this point.

"The general economy of the Board of Education was proved by a comparison with other benevolent institutions. The average expense of six or seven of the principal voluntary societies, was, last year, about twenty-three per cent. of their income, as appears from Dr. Plumer's report, whilst the expense of the Board of Education was twenty per cent.

"The Boards submit cheerfully to the supervision of the General Assembly, and will of course comply with all their orders: but they hope the Assembly will protect them from unreasonable agitation, and unfounded and injurious imputations. Let us have investigation according to the usual forms of law and equity, and every facility will be offered by the Boards to any committee they may appoint."

WALTER LOWRIE, Esq., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, said it was only at the earnest request of several brethren, that he said any thing on this report. He was always in favour that the fullest examination should be made in this Assembly, and had once and again suggested that a committee consisting of one elder from each Synod should be appointed at each session of the Assembly to examine these matters.

There are two questions involved in this report.

1st. Can the Assembly manage these details?

2nd. Are the charges and complaints well founded?

The report objects to the travelling expenses of officers and agents.

The report objects to their present salaries.

The report objects to the entire system of agents.

If the travelling expenses of the officers and agents were every year alike, then they might be discontinued, and a fixed salary allowed for both. But these expenses are different in different years. The agents go where they are sent by the Boards, and if they travel 5000 miles, they incur more expense than if they travel but 1000. In my own case my traveling expenses have varied very much. One year \$40, another \$75.

One year I spent seven months in the south, and the expense was \$500, which however, I paid myself. Last year I was three months visiting the Indians, the expense was \$165. This was paid from another source. These variations show that a fixed sum would not meet the case.

It was with pain I heard the remarks made on the salary and expenses of Mr. Wilson, representing him as trying to get both his hands into the treasury of the Board.

Judge Hepburn.—I did not name any one, nor did I use that expression.

Mr. Lowrie.—As to the name, the brother read from a printed report, in the hands of the members, where the name is given. The expression is my own, nor was it too strong for the effort made to prove extravagance in the case of this agent. Now what are the facts of this case. Mr. Wilson reached this country, last fall was a year. As soon as he arrived, the Colonization Society offered him \$2000 a year, if he would become their agent. His wish was to take charge of a church, but with some reluctance he accepted an agency from the Foreign Board. His salary for the first year was just one half that had been offered from the Colonization Society. It was found that a residence in Winchester was inconvenient for his field of labour, and it was deemed best that he remove to Philadelphia, and that his salary be \$1500. This sum is less than the average salaries of the pastors in that city. It is still \$500 less than he could have received. The travelling expenses amount to a large sum, but the distance travelled is large, being 8596 miles, from Georgia to Western New York. Ten years ago Mr. Wilson was an agent for a short time in our service. Some of the brethren here recollect the meeting at the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1836. At that time this young brother subscribed \$1000, all the money he had, in aid of this cause. He has manifested the same spirit now, and yet this is one of the men, held up before this Assembly, and a crowded gallery, as extravagantly using the funds of the church.

The case of Mr. Rogers, as an agent, is very similar. At first he would not take more salary than \$600, believing that he could support his family on that sum. It was found too low and it was raised to \$800, which is still low. His field is large,

and the travelling expenses must be large or he cannot reach the important points.

As to the salaries of the secretaries, I have very little to say. I have not the least objection to their reduction to \$1800. Nominally that will take \$200 from my salary: but in reality it is no reduction at all. Generally I have drawn the \$2000, but I have paid back again more than the \$200. Dr. Van Rensselaer has stated the principle on which his salary is paid. Although drawn from the Board it is all returned. I cannot go so far as that, but cheerfully act on the same principle. It is to me a matter of deep regret that we have to refer to these things thus publicly.

The chairman of this committee calls for explanation on one item in the treasurer's account. The travelling expenses of officers of the Board and voluntary agents, \$173.32. I can give the substance of each item, even here; at the office the exact sums are kept; \$100 of this sum is for an able agent employed in the Synod of Georgia, for his expenses merely. Most of the balance is for my own expenses—for a journey to meet the Synod of Pittsburg—a visit to the Indian department at Washington, and a visit to Baltimore—to send a missionary to Africa. The chairman of the committee says it is not his place to seek for this information, it ought to be furnished. Mr. Moderator, let me call his attention to some things which he seems to have overlooked. All these items of expense, as well as all other expenditures come before the Executive Committee. Who are the men forming that committee? Mr. Lowrie read the names. These men surely are competent to decide whether this \$173.32 is right or not. The laymen on the Executive Committee are among the most liberal contributors you have. Few of your Synods contribute as much as they do. Sir, if I had taken the course suggested by the chairman, and when I met you and the other brethren here, had commenced an explanation of this item, you would have thought I was deranged. This report, Mr. Moderator, strikes at the entire system of agency. If the Assembly adopt it, every agent will resign. I am not going to discuss this question. But I call upon the Assembly to meet the responsibility which will then rest upon them. For the Foreign Board we need a larger amount of funds than at any previous time, and I trust the Assembly will not disturb existing arrangements, without providing other measures equally efficient.

I know, Mr. Moderator, how precious is the time of this Assembly. I could add much more, but I forbear. It is an easy matter to find fault. It is easy to furnish excuses to those who are unwilling to give any thing to support the Saviour's cause. We find difficulties enough in conveying forward these great interests, without meeting with unmerited rebuke and injustice here.

After the further discussion of this subject by different members of the house the previous question was called for and the following resolution moved by the Rev. D. V. Maclean, was adopted with only two or three dissenting voices, viz.

"Resolved, That after a full investigation of the affairs of our Boards, and especially of their financial arrangements, this Assembly express the highest confidence in their respective managements, and in the faithful and economical service of their respective officers; and we do hereby earnestly recommend the Boards and their officers to the confidence and patronage of the Church."

After this matter was disposed of, a motion was made to transfer the Board of Missions to Pittsburg. A western member in discussing this question, said that those who were so desirous to get the Board west, were men who had come from the east; the real western men were willing it should remain where it is, and that the eastern churches should experience the full truth of the declaration, It is more blessed to give than to receive. Dr. Wm. McDowell, Secretary of the Board, being called upon for an expression of his views said:

*"Mr. Moderator—*This call to address the Assembly is altogether unexpected, and as my brethren well know, I speak with difficulty, and under some peculiar embarrassments. The motion before the house, as I understand it, is, "to remove the Board of Missions, or the seat of their operations, to Pittsburg." In the few remarks I have to make, I shall not enter into the argument for or against this proposition, but simply state to the Assembly, and will do it with great frankness, what I am persuaded would be the natural and necessary result of such a measure.

"It is admitted by all, that *the West* is the *great missionary field* in this land. In regard to this there is no difference of opinion. The Board are fully sensible of the strong claims of the west. They have given unequivocal evidence of their interest

in the great West. To supply the west with an intelligent, devoted ministry, has always been with them a leading object, and this has been the strongest ground of their appeals to the churches.

“While it is admitted that the West is the *great field* of operation, it is by no means the *whole field*. East of the mountains there is a very extensive, and a very important missionary field. Including Wisconsin and Michigan, and extending on the Atlantic coast to the Gulph of Mexico—lies an immense field, with extensive moral wastes. And the ministers and churches east of the mountains, while they feel a deep interest to the west, and are ready to aid in sending the gospel to the whole west, do not, and will not, feel at liberty to *neglect the destitutions on their own side of the mountains*; they cannot do it in faithfulness to their solemn trust. The field is one, and the whole, and all parts of it demand our attention.

“Although the *geographical centre* of this great field is west of the mountains, the *business centre* is east. And while this is the case, every business man knows, there is an advantage in having the seat of operations near, or in the centre of business. There is no difficulty in managing your missionary operations for the whole west, in any well chosen point east of the mountains. And while the west need the men and the means of the east, there is an important advantage *to the west*, in having the seat of operation in the east, where the surplus men and means are to be found. My decided conviction is, if a change must be made, which I certainly do not consider either necessary or wise—but, if you must change, *for the benefit of the west*, go east. Go to New York. The interests of the west I am persuaded would be much more effectually promoted by going to the city of New York, than by removing to any point which could be selected west of the mountains. While the operations in the west can be managed without difficulty, and with advantage, in any of our eastern cities, we ask how the missionary operations on the whole Atlantic coast, are to be managed from any point west of the mountains? Every man of practical good sense, who is at all conversant with the matter, must answer—*It cannot be done to advantage*. The men, and the means for this whole field, east of the mountains, are here, not in the west; and the whole business is done, not in the west, but here. The operations east of

the mountains, cannot be managed in the west without much loss, and great embarrassment. What, then, must be the natural and necessary result of a removal? The answer, to my mind, is plain and obvious—a *separate organization for the Atlantic slope*. The brethren east will be compelled, in self-defence, and to supply their own immense destitutions, to adopt some such plan. Surely this is not to be desired. The field is one, and we should all be willing, and anxious to adopt the plan which will concentrate the strength of the whole Church, to bear with most advantage on each and every part.”

Such was the result of this protracted debate. We have no doubt it will do great good. It must indeed be very trying to the patience of the laborious and self-denying servants of the Church, who are engaged in a thankless office, sent to solicit money, and exposed to constant mortifications and difficulties, to be arraigned on vague rumors, and charged with serious negligence if nothing worse, before the whole Assembly, but the opportunity thus afforded them of vindicating their conduct removes many smothered misgivings, and calls forth the expression of the real estimate in which they are held by the church, and the attachment felt by the great body of our ministers and members to the work in which they are engaged.

Reports on the Theological Seminaries.

The report of the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary having been read was referred to a committee, who subsequently presented the following report, which was adopted unanimously; viz.

“*Resolved*, That the said report (viz. of the Directors of the Western Seminary) be approved and printed in the appendix to the minutes of the assembly.

“*Resolved*, That the General Assembly learn with great pleasure that the labours of the distinguished and faithful professors of this institution continue to be crowned with success and that students highly respectable not only in number but also in piety, talents and attainments avail themselves of those valuable labours.

“*Resolved*, That with unmingled satisfaction, the Assembly are informed that this seminary has lately passed in safety through a threatening crisis in its affairs, and that now no reasonable doubt can exist as to the speedy completion of the plan

of endowment which for several years has so worthily engaged the efforts of the churches in the region of its location.

“Resolved, That the General Assembly have no hesitation in recommending the endowment and support of this seminary, as objects worthy of the liberal pecuniary contributions not simply of the Synods which have heretofore nobly borne the burden, but also of all other portions of the Presbyterian Church which appreciate sound and thorough Theological training as well as cultivation of ministerial and missionary zeal.”

The report of the Directors of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, was referred to a committee, who presented a report which was amended, adopted and is as follows:

“The committee appointed to examine the Report of the Directors of Princeton Seminary, beg leave to say, that this document appears to have been prepared after the manner of previous reports. The whole report covers less than five small letter sheet pages, openly written, of which nearly three are mere lists of names. It is impossible from the report to form any idea concerning the presence or absence of a missionary spirit amongst the students; of the general spirit of piety, during the last year in the Seminary; or, indeed to form any correct opinion whether the students now in the Seminary promise usefulness in the pastoral office, or the contrary. It is currently reported and believed that regular instruction is given in the Hebrew language, in the Seminary, by one person upon whose character and qualifications the Assembly has not passed; yet no allusion is made in the report to this important fact. The Assembly considers such an omission as improper, and such action in reference to the appointment of a Hebrew teacher, without the knowledge of this body, as inconsistent with the laws of the Institution, and with the relations in which it stands to the General Assembly.

“From the number of young men reported to be members of the Seminary, and from the proficiency accredited to the students by the Examining Committee, *we infer* that this important school of the prophets maintains its high position, and was never in a more prosperous state.

“It is however to be regretted that the Directors have not favoured the Assembly with more of that information in regard to the Seminary which ought to be expected and received. We are constrained to regard it as an exceedingly grave defect, when

a report from such a source, and upon such a subject leaves the Assembly so much in the dark, with regard to the vital matters of the trust, nor does it seem to us to be expedient that the church should be left, as in this instance, to general rumor for its knowledge of what is officially done by the Directors of the Seminary."

The General Assembly is so exalted a body, it has so much dignity as the representative of our whole church, it is clothed with so much authority, and is entitled to so much deference as "an ordinance of God,"* that its censures fall with tremendous weight. Those on whom they fall cannot fail to be deeply pained by the infliction. A very grave responsibility, therefore, is assumed by those who put words of rebuke into the mouth of such a body, and by those who sanction them without due consideration. No such assembly, however, is infallible. They may err through want of information, or error of judgment, and it is at once the right and duty of all concerned, to subject their decisions, especially when they affect the character and conduct of such a body of venerable men, to a respectful and candid examination.

The first ground of the censure passed on the Princeton Directors, is the meagerness of their report. This Board are rebuked for not giving more definite information as to the internal condition of the Seminary, the degree in which the missionary spirit and spirit of piety prevail among the students, and of their general proficiency and promise. The Assembly, it is said, are left "*to infer*" that the institution is in a flourishing state, but it is noticed as "a grave defect" that the report of the Directors gives no definite information on this subject.

In reference to this point, it may be remarked, that the present report is as full in relation to these matters as any presented to the Assembly for the last twenty or thirty years. If a change in the manner of reporting was desired, the Board might not unreasonably expect that some intimation of such desire should be given, instead of censuring them for a mode of reporting which had met the approbation of the Assembly, for a long series of years. Besides this, the report from the Directors of the Western Theological Seminary, was received with cordial and unanimous approbation. That report, however, is scarcely

*See Westminster Confession, chapter on Councils.

one third the length of the report under consideration. It is a mere business document. It does not say a word about the religious condition of the institution committed to the care of those Directors. The question must suggest itself, why is the one of these reports received with unanimous approval, and the other with rebuke? They are, as to this ground of censure, precisely alike. They stand side by side in the columns of the Presbyterian; where our readers may compare them, and see if they can discover any reason why the one should be censured for its silence as to the internal state of the Seminary, and the other cordially approved. If the one Board deserved no censure for silence on this point, where is the justice of so severe a rebuke for a like silence in the other?

The second ground of censure is presented in the following passage: "It is currently reported and believed that regular instruction is given in the Hebrew language, in the Seminary, by one person on whose character and qualifications the Assembly has not passed; yet no allusion is made in the report to this important fact. The Assembly considers such an omission as improper, and such action in reference to the appointment of a Hebrew teacher, without the knowledge of this body, as inconsistent with the laws of the Institution, and with the relations in which it stands to the General Assembly."

If this means that the Board of Directors were bound to report their action on this subject, to the General Assembly, it is readily admitted. It is to be remembered however that the Board have two methods of reporting. The one is by a general abstract of their proceedings, in the form of an annual report, and the other is by placing their whole records on the table of the House. One of the provisions of the plan of the Seminary is, "The secretary of the Board, shall keep an accurate record of all the proceedings of the Directors; and it shall be his duty to lay these records, or a faithful transcript of the same, before the General Assembly annually, for the unrestrained inspection of all the members." Article 4, § 4. It will be perceived that this is made the duty of the secretary, independently of any order of the Board. The Directors have nothing to do with it. Without their action, and in spite of their prohibition, the secretary is bound to place the full record of their proceedings before the Assembly. An organic provision is thus made for the

fullest kind of report being annually presented of every act and resolution of the Directors. The Board therefore were entitled to assume that all their proceedings had been officially communicated to the Assembly.

If on the present, or any other occasion, the minutes of the Directors were not exhibited, that was no fault of the Board. They knew nothing of it. It was by no neglect or connivance on their part. They were no more to blame in the matter, than a Synod would be for failing to send up their records, when that failure was occasioned by the mail or the forgetfulness of their stated clerk.* That the appointment of a Hebrew teacher, was not mentioned in the annual report, is a matter of surprise and regret. It was no doubt an oversight arising from the manner in which the subject came before the Board, no name being mentioned, but authority given to employ such an instructor. Everything however, was published to the world in the annual catalogue of the Seminary, and the Directors could have small hope of keeping the knowledge of such a public fact, from the Assembly, if any one can suppose such was their intention.

The passage just quoted, however, may mean not merely to censure the Directors for not reporting the appointment of a Hebrew teacher, but to assert that they had no right to make such an appointment. If this were its intention, it involves a perfectly novel interpretation of the constitution of the Seminary, and of the relation of the Directors to the Assembly. That relation is in a great measure analogous to that which is sustained by the other Boards of the church. The Board of Missions, for example, is appointed for the conduct of our missionary operations. They receive their appointment from the Assembly; from that body they derive all their powers, and to it they are responsible for all their acts. They are the representatives and agents of the Assembly for a specific work. The Assembly itself does not conduct the missions, that office is delegated to the

* We do not intend to make any reflexion on the Secretary of the Board, who for thirty-six years has so faithfully performed the duties of his office. The Board meet on the Monday preceding the opening of the Assembly. He has but one day at command to transcribe his minutes. When the Assembly meets at a distance from the residence of the Secretary, it is difficult for him to forward the records. All the delegates are already on their way to the place of meeting, so that it is impossible for him to have his book on the table of the assembly, at least at the opening of its sessions.

Board. In like manner the Directors of our Theological Seminaries, are appointed by the Assembly for the actual management of those institutions. They derive all their powers from the Assembly, and to it they are responsible for all their acts. But they can act within their legitimate sphere. The Assembly does not and cannot exercise the task of immediate supervision, any more than it immediately conducts the work of missions. It never meets in the places where the Seminaries are located; it never has the professors before them; it never calls on them to report their mode of instruction; it never examines the students. This is a task which it has committed to the Directors. It is indeed the peculiar advantage of those Seminaries which are under the care of the General Assembly, that the ultimate appeal in all cases is to the representatives of the whole church. Those Seminaries therefore, cannot become materially corrupt, until the majority of the whole church is unfaithful to its trust. This is an invaluable safeguard; and no true friend of those institutions would wish to see them removed from the control of the Assembly, or the vigilance of that body in the least degree relaxed. At the same time it is apparent, from the very nature of the case, that the immediate conduct of them must be committed to their respective Boards.

The relation however of the Directors to the Assembly is not left to be inferred from analogy and the general principles of propriety. It is clearly determined by the written constitution of the Seminary. According to that constitution, the Assembly has reserved to itself the right to appoint all the principal officers, of determining salaries, of sanctioning their laws, prescribing the course of study, and of altering the constitution. To the Board of Directors is committed the right of making their own bye-laws, of directing the professors as to the subjects of their instruction, so far as the same is not prescribed by the Plan or by the orders of the Assembly; of inspecting the fidelity of the professors, of reporting or suspending them from office, if unfaithful or incompetent; of watching over the conduct of the students; making temporary arrangements for their instruction; examining into their proficiency; and of recommending to the Assembly any measure they deem expedient for the benefit of the Institution committed to their care. See *Plan*, Arts. 1 and 2.

The Assembly in reserving the right to appoint the "princi-

pal officers" of these Seminaries, and expressly giving the Directors authority to make temporary provision for their instruction, has in the Plan itself conceded the right to the Board of appointing subordinate temporary teachers, as circumstances may require. This interpretation of the powers of the Directors has been sanctioned by the Assembly so often, as to be perfectly established. In 1826 the Directors of the Seminary at Princeton appointed Mr. John W. Nevin, teacher of Hebrew during the temporary absence of the professor of that department. In 1833 they appointed the Rev. Austin O. Hubbard, to the same service; afterwards the Rev. Mr. Jacobus, now of Brooklyn, was employed in the same way. The Western Board have had occasion still more frequently and extensively to act upon this interpretation of their powers, and have always been borne out in so doing. In the year 1827, Dr. Janeway not having immediately accepted his appointment as professor in the Western Seminary, the Directors on their own authority appointed their secretary and the Rev. Mr. Stockton to conduct the instruction of the students. In 1830 they inform the Assembly they had been "so felicitous as to obtain the services of the Rev. John W. Nevin, in the department of Oriental and Biblical Literature." Mr. Nevin acted under this appointment of the Board for a number of years. In 1840 the Directors say: "The Board have to report that the Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D. has resigned his chair of Oriental and Biblical Literature for the purpose of accepting the presidency of the German Reformed Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa. Thus a very important vacancy has been occasioned in our Institution, which the Board are anxious to have filled as soon as a suitable person can be obtained. In the meantime, the department vacated by Professor Nevin, will be attended to, according to a private arrangement of the Board, by some of the ministers resident in Alleghany city." In 1838 among the list of the officers of the Seminary, appears the name of the Rev. A. D. Campbell, "as teacher of Church Government and general agent." In the report for the year 1842, it is said: "At a meeting of the Board of Directors, held September 8th, 1841, it was unanimously agreed to invite the Rev. Alexander T. McGill, of the Presbytery of Carlisle, to become an instructor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in our Institution, until such time as the General Assembly should fill the

chair of that department of study with a regular professor; and during the winter session Mr. McGill has been connected with the Institution in the office to which he was invited by the Board, whose duties he has fulfilled with very great acceptance. The Board now request the General Assembly, during their present session, to fill the chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government." Dr. McGill, was agreeably to this request elected by the Assembly. It is also understood that a converted Jew was for some time employed as teacher of Hebrew in that Seminary, of which fact we find no record on the minutes.

We now submit whether the Board of Directors of the Princeton Seminary transcended their powers in appointing on an emergency, a temporary assistant teacher of Hebrew. Could they reasonably have anticipated a rebuke for doing what the Plan of the Seminary seems so plainly to authorize, and which they had repeatedly done before with the subsequent sanction of the Assembly? Could they have expected to be censured for what they knew the Western Board had been allowed time after time to do, without the slightest manifestation of disapprobation? We are persuaded that this report would neither have been proposed nor adopted, had its author or the Assembly had the facts of the case fairly before them.

We understand that when this report was first introduced, it was on motion of Judge Hepburn, placed on the docket, and when towards the close of the sessions of the Assembly, it was again called up, that gentleman proposed a number of amendments reflecting severely on the Board, which amendments were not adopted. Of the debate on those amendments we have seen no report. It is deeply to be regretted that while the debates of political bodies, and of religious meetings in our own and other countries, are so fully reported, we have the most meagre accounts of the discussions in our Assembly. The whole church takes a deep interest in those debates. They are in a high degree instructive, and very often parties concerned in the action of the house, are left ignorant of the views of their brethren, which it may be a matter of no small moment for them to know. We have heard that some member on the floor was disposed to deny to the Board of Directors the right of even making recommendations of instructors in our Seminaries. It is to be presumed that member never read the Plan or constitution of those institutions. It

is there said, "The Board of Directors may recommend such measures for the advantage of the seminary, as to them may appear proper." Is not this a recognition of the right in question? It is a right which has been acknowledged time after time by the Assembly. In 1833 the Western Board resolved, "That it is expedient to appoint an additional professor, and the Rev. Ezra Fish, D.D. be recommended to the Assembly and that they be respectfully requested at their next meeting to appoint him to the professorship of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government." In 1836 the same Board recommended, that Dr. Halsey should be transferred to the chair of Ecclesiastical History, and Dr. Eliot to that of Theology. The Assembly did not resent these recommendations, as an unauthorised interference with their own prerogatives, but kindly entertained them, and as they met their approbation gave them effect. In 1840 the Princeton Board resolved, "That the Assembly be requested to make the following change in the titles of two professors, viz., that Dr. Hodge be made Professor of Exegetical and Didactic Theology, and that the title of Dr. Alexander hereafter be, Professor of Pastoral and Polemic Theology." This recommendation the Assembly adopted by an unanimous vote.

Is there any thing wrong in this? If the youngest man on the floor of the Assembly may recommend whom he pleases, is it wrong that thirty ministers and elders set to preside over an institution, should have the same privilege? Are they less likely to be wise and conscientious in their recommendations? Can any one believe that truth and piety would be better promoted by denying this reasonable privilege to our Boards? Is it not conceded that refusing to bodies of men their legitimate influence, is the surest way to throw that influence into the hands of individuals, who have no special claim to its exercise? Of one thing we presume every one is satisfied, and that is, that no true friend of either of our Seminaries would wish to see a man introduced to them as a professor, who had not the confidence of the whole church, and who was not the unbiassed choice of the General Assembly. The only question is, how to prevent that choice from being unduly biassed.

ART. V.—*Institutio Theologiae Elencticae. Authore Francisco Turretino, in Ecclesia et Academia Genevensi Pastore et S.S. Theologiae Professore.* Four volumes, 8vo. New York: R. Carter. 1847.

A WORK of more than two thousand closely printed pages, in Latin, strikes us as a novelty in American publication. Indeed it results from the joint endeavour of enterprising publishers in New York and Edinburgh. It has long been admitted that Francis Turretin was the best expounder of the doctrine of the Reformed Church, as matured into completeness of form in the period following the Synod of Dort. The old editions of the Institutes, in four quartos, have for some years been rare and costly. We happen to know of numerous instances in which they have been imported directly, and at high prices; indeed for some time it has been hard to get them at any. A disgust with compendious or superficial systems had at the same time been leading many of our young clergymen to inquire for Turretin; and his great work had been adopted as a text-book in several seminaries. For it has now for years been apparent to the public, what kind of theology was generated by the methods of those schools which hoodwinked their pupils in regard to the giants of Protestant theology, under pretext of having no text-book but the Bible; who carried the pedigree of theologians no further back than a century; whose whole library contained no Latin volume; and whose model names were only such as Bellamy, Hopkins, and Emmons. Men of education in all our churches were demanding a more generous and a more masculine preparation in their religious teachers. Knowing as they did that theology is a science, and that in all sciences the history of opinion, in its gradual development, is an indispensable aid in the prosecution of truth, they detected the meagerness of a training which deliberately cut off the young theologian from all acquaintance with the monuments of reformation-theology, and which condemned whole libraries of pious learning under the name of Scholastic rubbish. The policy of such training and such proscription was apparent. There can be no better field for sowing the tares of new divinity, than the minds of novices, uncatechized in childhood, untouched by logical dis-

cipline in youth, prejudiced against the schemes of truth which they could not understand, and gaping for the latitudinary definitions and dogmas of a narrow, inelegant, *médiocre* and neological metaphysic. We could name some, who from the straitened confines of this dark glen, have come to the mountain tops of a free and enlarged theology, and have felt the delight of an extended prospect, taking in not the petty controversies of the hour, but the sublime circuit of all past disquisition. This expansion of view is the glory of the theology of the Reformed Church. It comprises philosophy, history and polemics. At every step the learner beholds not only the naked truth, but all its leading counterfeits, all its train of developments, all its settlements by councils and crystalization in symbolic formulas, all its champions and opposers. Such a mode of treatment made the books indeed voluminous; producing such works as those of Chamier, Du Moulin, Gomar, Chemnitz, Twiss and De Moor; works far too large for students whose course of study was guided by a brace of octavos or the notes of a loose heterodox professor. But study of these elaborate works had this advantage among many others, that it saved from the disgrace of carrying home a hundred heresies, as if they were just created by the mighty genius of a modern master, when in truth they had been spawned and strangled centuries ago. It showed them that a large part of the objections urged against the doctrines of grace by the new divinity, are the identical objections which were far more ably urged by Pelagius and Celestius, or by Estius and Episcopius, or by the Jesuits and Molinists. A disposition to give a wider scope to the inquiries of the student tended to increase the demand for such a book as Turretin.

The true name is TURRETTINI, and so it is now written and pronounced in Geneva; we simply conform to an English usage in writing *Turretin*; in like manner Mazarini has become Mazarin. In some of the later branches, we observe the form *Turretini de Turretin*. In order to gratify a curiosity which we know to exist among many, we will proceed to give a few statements respecting the descent of our eminent theologian; and in doing this we shall not confine ourselves to the notices contained in Pictet's funeral oration, but shall resort to Genevese authorities which have not heretofore been used in America.

"The family of Turretini," says M. Galiffe, in his *Genealogi-*

cal Notices of Genevese Families, "belonging to the ancient nobility of the republic of Lucca, and one of the most distinguished among them, has maintained the same rank in our own, from the epoch of its admission to citizenship until the present time. It has produced celebrated savans and numerous magistrates of high merits. Its arms are *Palé de queueles et d'or de six pièces*. These arms are borne on the wing of an imperial eagle, by virtue of a special grant." The family of Turretini has preserved an authentic genealogy at Lucca; from which it appears to have given a number of gonfalonieri and anziani to that repnblc. The first whom we shall mention is REGULUS TURRETTINI, gonfalonier, that is, chief-magistrate, of the republic of Lucca. In 1573 he married Clara Franciotti, of a family which produced the Cardinal Antonio Marco Franciotti, archbishop of Lucca in 1634. One of his sons remained a papist, and was anzian of Lucca, in 1616. The other son was Francis Turretini, distinguished as the first of the Protestant line. He was born about 1547, and was one of the most ardent defenders of the reformation, and was grandfather of our author. Instead of remaining where he might have risen to family honours, he became a voluntary exile. He went first to Antwerp. Thence, when that city, was besieged by the duke of Parma, he fled first to Geneva and then to Zurich. Afterwards he returned to Geneva, where he spent the remainder of his days. It appears from his will, that he wrote many letters to his parents to bring them over to Protestantism. He received citizenship in 1627, was made one of the Sixty in 1628, and died the same year, aged eighty-one years. He left fifty-one thousand florins to public charities. He was a man of strict integrity and blameless reputation, openhanded, brave and true. Of his nine children, the oldest was the father of our author, of whom we shall have a few words to say.

BENEDICT TURRETTINI was born at Zurich, November 9, 1588. He was a celebrated pastor and professor of Theology. He was married May 26, 1616, to Louisa Perez, and died March 4, 1631. Pictet speaks of Benedict as the glory of that church and school; he calls him a trumpet, and a tower. He was a champion of the truth. In 1620 he assisted at the Synod of Alez, of which Peter du Moulin was the moderator. He was noted for his piety, his love of union, his resolution, his learning, his gentleness and his

eloquence. His career was cut short as he was just entering middle life. No man of his day was more honoured. By the noble lady whom he married, he had six children, of whom the third in order, the author of these volumes, is now to be mentioned.

FRANCIS TURRETTINI, son of Benedict, was born October 23, 1623.* In the same year died Mornay du Plessy, Fra Paolo, and pope Gregory XV. In the same year, moreover, as Pictet tells us, the great Synod of Charenton was held, and the church of Geneva began to use leavened bread at the Lord's Supper. From his earliest years young Turretin gave tokens of genius. When his father found himself to be dying, he caused Francis, then about eight years old, to be brought to his bed-side, and said with faltering lips, "This child is marked with God's seal;" *Hic sigillo Dei obsignatus est!* Francis greatly distinguished himself in his academic course, and seems to have been remarkable for the eagerness with which he attempted diversified branches of study. Upon devoting himself to theology, he enjoyed the advantage of eminent instructors. Among these was John Diodati, another Italian Protestant, who sat in the chair of Calvin and Beza. Diodati was noted in the Synod of Dort and the Convention of Saumur; at which he so succeeded in pouring oil on the waters of controversy that the queen of France thanked him repeatedly. His biblical labours are well known. A second instructor of our author was Theodore Tronchin, also a member of the Synod of Dort, and a noble defender of truth. He lived to a venerable age, and contributed much to the theological celebrity of Geneva. The Tronchin family was noted in the little republic, to which it came from Provence. It has its representatives now. The name of colonel Tronchin is known far and wide among evangelical Christians. Theodore married Mademoiselle de Besze, the adopted daughter of Beza; and was the ancestor of the famous physician of the same name, son-in-law of the grand-pensionary De Witt. We almost lament that we cannot dilate upon this extraordinary family. Frederick Spanheim was another instructor of young Turretin; he was father of two celebrated sons, Ezekiel and Frederick. After finishing his curriculum at home, Turretin went to Leyden,

* Galiffe.

which was then, and long after, a centre of learning and theology. Here he maintained theses in the schools with great eclat. In Holland he enjoyed the lectures of such men as Polyander; the saintly Rivet, equally known by his voluminous works and the record of his death; Salmasius, whom we must not degrade from his deserved place as one of the most learned men of his age, even though he were worsted by Milton; Heinsius, Trigland, Voet, Hoornbeek, and Golius the linguist. At Utrecht he became acquainted with that prodigy of her age, Anna Maria Schurman. In 1645 he proceeded to Paris. There he found Falcar, Drelincourt, Albertini, and Blondel; and he resided under the roof of the immortal Dailé. He pursued physical and astronomical studies under Gassendi. Next he visited Saumur. This little city on the Loire has been famous for its Protestant University. Turretin there heard Placaeus, Amyrauld, and Cappellus, men whose learning, subtilty and peculiar views in theology are fully presented in the *Theses Salmurienses*. He even went as far south as to Montauban, then as now a Protestant University, where Carolus and Garissol were at that time flourishing. In 1648 he became a pastor of the church of Geneva, and preacher to the Italian congregation. For, as Pictet observes, Turretin preached with equal ease in Latin, French, and Italian. This was the more necessary, as the city was an asylum for great numbers of refugees from Italy. When he began to preach, such were the flow of his discourse, the solidity of his matter, and the majestic gracefulness of his eloquence, that immense popularity attended him. In 1650, the chair of Philosophy was several times offered to him by the government. After the death of Aaron Morus, at Leyden, Turretin was called to supply his place as pastor. He accepted the invitation and remained in Leyden about a year; but the Genevese would not endure his longer absence. The venerable Tronchin had now outlived his capacity for public service, and Turretin was invited to fill his place. He assumed the theological chair in 1653, having for colleagues, Tronchin, Antoine Leger, and Philip Mestrezat. His Inaugural Discourse was upon the first verse of the Epistle to the Hebrews. As a public teacher he was faithful and undaunted. The errors of Popery, Socinianism, and Arminianism, were daily receiving blows at his hand. He thundered against prevailing immoralities. With many tears he besought sinners to be reconciled to

Christ. At the time of his death almost every Pastor in Geneva and its vicinity had come from under his instructions. Pictet celebrates his benignity, pity to the poor, and care of widows and orphans, his hospitality and his profitable discourse. For many years he presided over the Academy, and was often called to pronounce those stately orations, which were the fashion of the age. In the year 1561 he was summoned to a new service. The people of Geneva were unable to bear the expense of fortifying their walls; they therefore appealed for aid to the States General of Holland, and designated Turretin as their commissioner for this end. His father had been sent by them on a similar errand forty years before. He passed through Basle, where he was received with honour by the great men of that university, Wetstein, Wollebius, Werenfelsius, and others. From the authorities in Holland he received the compliment of a gold chain and medal. He used to relate with pleasure the distinction with which he was received by the great Prince of Orange, and all the learned Hollanders. Earnest attempts were made to detain him both at Leyden and the Hague. He returned by the way of Paris. At Charenton he preached before that vast Protestant assembly, of which Pictet speaks with singular admiration. There he first met the famous John Claude. Coming home he renewed his labours with redoubled zeal. In 1669 he was married to Isabella, daughter of John de Masse, lord of Sauvet. The ancestors of Madame Turretin held the marquisate of Saluzzo. Four children were the fruits of this union, of whom one only survived, presently to be named more particularly. In 1664, Turretin published against the Papists, and in vindication of the Reformed. In 1666 he issued his disquisitions concerning the Satisfaction of Christ, which are reprinted in these volumes. In 1674 he set forth his great work on Theology. It is said that he was very reluctant to give it to the press, and that he did so only in compliance with letters from the learned in all parts of Reformed Christendom. In the same year were published his sermons, which were received with great applause; of these we have not been able to procure a copy. In 1687, he published on the necessity of Secession from Rome, and on other important points.

The later years of Turretin were embittered by the distresses and persecutions of his reformed brethren, in Piedmont

and France. It will be remembered, that in 1685 the Edict of Nantes was revoked by Louis XIV, in consequence of which hundreds of churches were demolished, and Protestantism was driven from the kingdom. But for these distresses of a sympathetic soul he may be said to have had a happy old age. He was scarcely ever ill, if we except a few attacks of acute disease. On the 24th of September, having risen before day, he wrote a number of letters, and was about to write others to Heidegger and Jurieu. He engaged in conversation with friends till about ten o'clock, when he was suddenly seized with violent pains. He caused his sister Madame Pietet to be sent for. To Professor Pietet he expressed his readiness to die, but said that the excruciating pains did not suffer him to pray as he would; yet that he knew in whom he had believed. He uttered many scripture passages, and among these one from the 38th Psalm, "O Lord rebuke me not in thine anger, &c.," which he had, a few days before, expounded, in the Italian congregation. Upon his only son, he solemnly enjoined these four things: the care of the church, if he should ever be called to it; the love of truth; humility; and charity. He was visited by his relative, Dr. Michel Turretin, Pastor and Oriental Professor, to whom he declared his faith and hope, and committed the solemn care of the church. His charges and exhortations were numerous. His countenance was expressive rather of triumph than of death. When his agony increased some of those who stood by reminded him of his last sermon, on the words, "Let us come boldly to the throne of grace:" he cried, as if impatient, *Eamus, eamus!* Shortly after he slumbered, and so died without a struggle, having attained the age of 64 years.

Though not in necessary connexion with the work under review, we shall now devote a little attention to another equally distinguished member of this family, and son of the preceding. JOHN ALPHONSO TURRETIN, the first of the name, was born August 13, 1671. In early youth he showed his bent towards literature, and that graceful attractiveness which characterized him through life. It is pleasing to remember, that he gained the marked attention of Burnet, afterwards bishop of Salisbury, who was at that period resident at Geneva. Being bereft of his father in 1687, when he was about sixteen; he then fell under the care of such preceptors as Louis Tronchin, Calandrini, and

Pictet. Tronchin once said, "This boy begins where others leave off." It was in that day thought an indispensable part of education to travel. Alphonso made a tour through Holland, which was then the garden of theological learning. He was brought into acquaintance with Perizonius, Braun, Spanheim, Le Clerc, Bayle, Superville, Jurieu, Basnage, de Beauval, Claude, and Saurin. According to the custom of the age, he maintained Latin theses, when at Leyden, in 1692. Passing over to England, where William of Orange had now been some years in power, young Turretin visited Cambridge and was made acquainted with Sir Isaac Newton; to whom he was perhaps the first to apply those words of Bacon: *Parum philosophiæ naturalis homines inclinare in atheismum, at altiorem scientiam eos ad religionem circumagere*. Renewing his acquaintance with Burnet he was through him admitted to the company of Whitby, Floyd, Wake and Tillotson. In 1693, he went to Paris, where he was introduced to Bossuet, Huet, Bignon, Mabillon, Malebranche, Baillet, Fontenelle, and Longuerue. He was admitted to the ministry about the year 1694. Alphonso Turretin was a preacher of unusual powers, being, like his father, equally at home in French, Latin and Italian. With the single exception of Calvin, it is probable that Geneva had no greater master of Latinity. It is recorded, that he also ventured to preach in English.

In 1697, Alphonso Turretin was called to the new chair of Ecclesiastical History. His lectures in this department resulted in his *Compendium of Church History*, in 1733. After his inauguration he made himself acquainted with most of the great men of the Swiss churches; among whom were Werenfelsius, Ostervald, Crousaz. When in 1713 Barbeyrac the jurist translated Tillotson's Sermons, he dedicated them to J. Alph. Turretin. In 1705, he succeeded the venerable Tronchin, in the chair of theology.

By a process of change, which has been not unfrequent, John Alphonso was as inferior to his father in vigour as he was superior to him in elegance. His whole theological tendency was marked by a fascinating liberalism, verging on what was latitudinarian. Very stern Calvinism, and a formal scholastic method, had prevailed in Geneva, and these were made still stronger, after the Synod of Dort. But looser sentiments were beginning to pre-

vail; the remote precursors of that neology which has since reigned. The body of the clergy became restiff under the creed, or *formulaire*, which was from time to time imposed.

Though we have not found it in books, we have been informed by the venerable Mr. Gallatin, himself a native of Geneva and a relative of the Turretins, that when in 1706, J. Alphonso proposed the abrogation of the *formulaire*, it was, beyond what was expected, adopted unanimously. This *formula consensus* had then been in use about forty years.* During these periods of change, Turretin's eager zeal for the evangelical union of Christians kept him in correspondence with men of different creeds and countries; with Jaquelot, Placette, Jablonski, Noltens, L'Enfant, Beausobre, and Magliabecchi. His dread of controversy, and his philosophical and tasteful pursuits, conduced to make him sink minor differences, and to give prominency to the truths in which many classes agree. Hence he contributed little or nothing to the elucidation of nice points in dogmatic theology, while he was one of the greatest writers of the age, upon natural religion and the external defences of Christianity. His copious and classical diction gave a charm to his writings which secured perusal and applause beyond the pale of Calvinistic bodies, and under this temptation he devoted himself to history to exegesis and to elegant letters. It was only a mode of the same influence which is perceptible in Grotius, and which at an earlier day had driven Le Clerc from Geneva; for, strange as it may seem, it is true, that before the abrogation of the formula, the land of the Synod of Dort was more tolerant than Geneva. The union of Protestants was very near his heart; on this subject he repeatedly published. The works of John Alphonso Turretin are extant in three large quarto volumes of uncommon beauty, but copies are exceedingly rare, even in Geneva. Some of the subjects are these: Ecclesiastical History; Commentary on the Romans; Twelve Dissertations on Natural Theology, a great work, of which the philosophical elegance can scarcely be too much lauded; Essays and Orations, on Theological Pacification; the Dissensions of Protestants; the Peace of Europe; the Adulterations of Christianity; Fundamental Arti-

* *Miscellanea Groningana*, Tom. II. fasc. 1, p. 166, 167.

cles in Religion ; Cloud of Witnesses for Peace among Protestants.*

The family of the Turretins was not continued very far in the direct line of our theologians. Of Francis the only son who lived to have issue was John Alphonso, who had a son and a daughter. Of these, the son, Mark Turretini, born in 1712, became the father of one son, John Alphonso the second, who was born in 1735, and died without issue.

Other collateral branches, however, produced persons of note, and are continued to this day. Before we dismiss the subject, we will make record of a few of these. The father of our author had a younger brother JOHN, who took the name of TURRETTINI DE TURRETTIN, in 1631. He was one of the Council of Sixty and had a numerous progeny. It was his son, MICHEL TURRETTINI DE TURRETTIN, who was pastor and professor of oriental languages ; he was born in 1646. The son of this Michel, named SAMUEL TURRETTINI DE TURRETTIN, born in 1688, was also pastor and professor of theology. A grandson of Michel, by another son, was professor of philosophy ; his name was GIDEON, and he died in 1782. Albert Turretini, son of the last named was syndic of Geneva as late as 1815. JOHN JAMES TURRETTINI, brother of Gideon the professor, was born in 1727, and was professor of law. It should seem that the Turretins now living in Geneva, are chiefly descendants of John Turretini de Turretin, the uncle of our author. From what has now been stated, the reader will perceive that the family of Turretini gave to the Academy of Geneva no less than seven professors.

It is not our purpose to dwell on the character of Francis Turretin as a theologian. His adherence to the received doctrine of the Reformed church is so uniform and strict, that there is no writer who has higher claims as an authority as to what that doctrine was. His distinguishing excellence is perspicuity and discrimination. His intellect was admirably fitted and trained for perceiving and stating the real principles in-

* The titles of Prof. Turretin's French works are subjoined. 1. *Defense de la Dissertation sur les Articles fondamentaux contre Mr. de Bionens.* 2. *Sermons : sur la Charité, 1696 ; sur le Jubilé de la Reformation de Zurich, 1719 ; etc., etc.* For most of the facts our authority is that rare work, the *Miscellanea Groningana*: 12mo. Groningen. 1739.

volved in theological questions. He furnishes the best illustration within our knowledge of the maxim, *qui bene distinguit bene docet*. To this primary excellence he added an admirable judgment, which is evinced in the characteristic moderation of his opinions, and the general soundness of his arguments. His method is simple and logical. Under every head he begins with the *Status Questionis*, and with discriminating accuracy, frees the subject in debate from all adventitious matter, and brings out the precise point to be considered. Then follows his arguments in numerical order, each distinct and in logical succession, in support of the position which he advocates. To this series of arguments succeeds the *Fontes Solutionum*, or answers to objections, which often furnish examples of as pithy and discriminating replies as are any where to be met with. There is scarcely a question which our divines have been discussing as American discoveries, which the student will not find settled, or at least considered, in the perspicuous pages of Turretin. His chapter *De Libero Arbitrio* we should prefer putting into the hands of a student, to any other treatise on the will, of the same size, within our knowledge.

We may justly congratulate the American public on the acquisition of so beautiful an edition, at so reasonable a price. The more ornate copies show well in any collection of elegant volumes. Though we covet more margin, we know the demands of economy, and cannot expect the old-time luxury of large-paper copies. The old quartos were full of typographical errors; these, we are assured, have been carefully corrected, under the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh. We would earnestly enjoin on every theological student the duty of saving money, to purchase a work which has long been almost inaccessible, and which is a library in itself. Young ministers who have any Latin, and who are not oppressed with undue fears of learning in the ministry, will need no counsel from us on this topic. Pious laymen, who wish to promote sound learning and to erect a barrier against the new divinity, should consider the good which may be done by presenting copies of this standard work to indigent ministers or parochial libraries. We were once told by Chief Justice Ewing, whose name we cannot write without love and reverence, that it was the uniform practice of Mr. Justice Washington, to read

through the whole of Blackstone's Commentaries once a year; and that he did so to give consistency, method and unity, to all the otherwise scattered and heterogeneous acquisitions of the year. We entertain no doubt, that a similar practice with regard to the equally logical and more commanding system of Turretin, would do more for a masculine theology and an energetic pulpit, than cart loads of religious journals, epitomes from the German, and occasional sermons.

ART. VI.—*The Power of the Pulpit.* By Gardiner Spring, D.D. New York: 1848.

IT is highly creditable to Dr. Spring's published writings, that they command a ready sale, and reach a large circle of readers, without any thing, either in their plan or execution, to excite or gratify a morbid curiosity. The topics treated for the most part are familiar, and the mode of treatment, though elaborate, by no means either startling or seductive. Their success must therefore be ascribed to the general soundness of their author's views, and still more to his weight of character and eminent position.

To this general statement, the volume now before us is a partial exception. From its first appearance, it attracted more attention than any of its predecessors, not only among Presbyterians, but in other churches, and this feeling of interest seems likely to continue and increase. But it is somewhat remarkable in this case, that the public curiosity has fastened on a single chapter near the close of the volume, and in its eagerness to feast on this, has, perhaps, done injustice to the rest. Whether this effect is owing to any thing peculiar in the actual position of the public mind, disposing it to feel a special interest in the subject of the chapter now in question, or to some superior vivacity and zeal displayed in that part of the work itself, we shall not venture to determine. But whatever be the cause, we cannot help believing that this chapter, if it had been published as a tract, apart from the highly respectable but less entertaining matter by which it is accompanied, would have had a circulation, and perhaps an influence, beyond any of the author's former publications. This indeed is no impossible result even

now, especially as the work, by a happy accident, has made its appearance at the very season most propitious to its practical effect and extended circulation.

The foregoing statement will suffice to justify us in confining our attention to that portion of the work which has especially arrested the attention of the public, the rather as the subject therein treated is entitled to the most deliberate consideration, and abundantly sufficient to fill all the time and space we have at command. The subject of the twentieth chapter is the training of men for the pulpit and the pastoral office in general. Dr. Spring avows his preference for the private method of theological education, by pastors, to the public or academical method now almost universally adopted in this country. His argument is reducible to these three propositions; that the ministry has sensibly deteriorated; that this deterioration has in part arisen from theological seminaries; and that this deteriorating influence of seminaries is owing, in great measure, to the practice of making men professors who have had no pastoral experience.

Our readers need not to be told that this is a most serious matter. Considered merely as a question of principle, it demands a grave consideration. But its importance becomes vastly greater when we look at the effects of a decision. If the doctrine of this chapter is true, if the impression which it is adapted and apparently designed to produce, should become general; then not only must those of our professors who have not been pastors, be dismissed from office, which would be a small matter, affecting only some two or three men in the whole church; but all theological seminaries should at once be suppressed, and a large proportion of our churches would be constrained to look upon their pastors as a dwarfed, degenerate race, tainted and crippled in their preparation for the sacred office. The first proposition, upon which the others rest, is vastly wider than the superstructure built upon it. If it be true, that the power of the pulpit is diminished and diminishing, whether the evil be imputed to professors or to pastors, to unsanctified learning or to secular ambition, to Hebrew or to stock-jobbing, the condemnation takes a fearful sweep. This whole argument against seminaries and non-pastoral professors, rests on the assumed degeneracy of the clergy. If they, on an aver-

age, are better or even as well fitted for their work as their predecessors, the whole argument falls to the ground. Let it be distinctly understood that we are called to grapple with a question which concerns not one or two professors merely, but a whole generation of ministers and the churches which they undertake to serve. It is therefore a question of the highest interest which is here presented. Has the ministry degenerated, and if this must be conceded, is the deterioration to be referred to their academical training?

We shall scarcely be credited by those who have not read Dr. Spring's book, when we say that there is no pretence of argument or evidence in support of his first and main proposition. The deterioration of the ministry is taken for granted, as a notorious or admitted fact. It is however neither notorious nor admitted. Nine out of ten, nineteen out of twenty, of all the intelligent men whom we ever heard speak on the subject, smile at the suggestion as an absurdity. They admit that names once adorned the church, to which we have none now to compare; just as history holds forth statesmen, orators, poets and artists, without any rivals of their fame in the present generation. But the question relates to the general efficiency of the ministry, not to extraordinary men, at any time rare, and at no time the product of education, but the gift and messengers of God. We do not hesitate to say that the great majority of competent judges regard the assertion that the ministry of our age and church, taken as a whole, are less qualified for their duties, less devoted, or less efficient, than their predecessors, taken as a whole, just as preposterous as the assertion that the arts, agriculture, and commerce of these United States have all retrograded during the last fifty years. Dr. Spring seems to have mistaken the unreflecting disposition, which is often indulged, to laud the past and detract from the present, as the expression of a settled conviction resting on satisfactory evidence. This disposition is very strong in men of a certain age or of a particular temperament. To such men nothing is right, and nothing as it once was. The world, the country, morals, religion, every thing which makes men good or happy, is on the wane. We have often heard men deplore the change which has occurred in the mode of travelling. When they were young it was a serious matter to go to a neighboring city;

weeks were spent in preparation for the journey, and a solemn adieu was bid to wife and children. Then the family relation was duly cherished; people were not forever on the wing, disregarding domestic ties in their feverish pursuit of excitement. This is well enough for sentiment, but a very frail foundation for an argument against steamboats and railroads. In the medical convention recently held in Baltimore, an old gentleman rose and said that with all the progress of science, and all the improvements in medical education, they had no such physicians now as when men were trained in a doctor's shop, and practised with simples. No one, however, took this to heart, or proposed that medical schools, lectures, and hospital services should be given up. No one was led to doubt that the medical profession as a whole was better educated, and furnished better physicians than the domestic practitioners of a former generation. Why then in so grave a matter should the vague declamation which even good men often fall into, be made the foundation of formal argument against the prevailing mode of theological education? Dr. Spring has erected his battery on quick-sand. He has taken for granted that which he ought to have proved. If the ministry is not deteriorated, then all he has written in this chapter, is solemn declamation and mischievous misrepresentation.

There are many causes which tend to produce this disposition to overrate the past and disparage the present. Men are apt to retain, in later life, the estimate of objects formed in childhood. The school-boy often looks upon the graduating student as a mature and even great man, and this impression may be cherished throughout life, especially when the opportunity of comparison with some acknowledged standard has been early lost. Names which we heard pronounced with reverence and admiration in our childhood, may still suggest the same associations, even in comparison with others more entitled to respect, but with which our acquaintance is more recent. Our whole point of view is changed. We naturally in our youth looked up to those so much our superiors in age and knowledge, whereas in mature life, such a man as Dr. Spring can find few to whom his upward gaze can be directed. He sees only such as are on a level with himself or below him. Unconscious of the change which has been silently going on in himself, he is disposed to think there are now no such men as those whom he once rever-

enced. Besides this, the lapse of time produces an illusion perfectly analogous to that of local distance. As the eye, in viewing a remote object, often discerns only what is bright and lofty, while every thing that is mean or offensive is concealed from view; so memory perpetuates the greatness and excellence of former generations, when these qualities really predominated; and brings them into advantageous contrast with the present, where the good and evil appear mixed, and the evil, from a natural cause easily detected, even unduly prominent. Of the distinguished men of former days we know little more than excellencies; their foibles and faults are, in a great measure, lost to our view.

The same illusion is promoted by the habit of confounding form with substance, and because the men of one age do not practise the same methods or exhibit the same aspect with their fathers, hastily concluding that they do not hold their principles, or labour in the same great cause. One of the strongest proofs that the gospel is of God may be derived from the co-existence of immutable constancy in that which is essential, with indefinite flexibility in that which is dependent on change of time and circumstances. Some of the worst practical errors have arisen from the vain attempt to make the gospel better than its author left it, by giving uniformity and stiffness to the very things which he designed should shape themselves to meet emergencies. To those who labour under this delusion, every change of form and method, even that which is essential to the efficacy of the system in existing circumstances, is regarded as a dangerous defection from the good old ways, and as a symptom of professional or personal degeneracy. Those, on the other hand, who believe that every age has something peculiar to itself, even in the application of the same unchanging truth to the production of the same result, are very little influenced by such proofs of deterioration, and are even apt to think that if the good men, from whom they are accused of defection, were alive now, they would do the very things in which that defection is asserted to consist.

Perhaps the greatest source of error on this subject, is the habit of judging of an age by a few conspicuous men. Dr. Spring and his single-minded converts are disposed to ask, Where are the men who can compare with Edwards, Whitefield and Davies? So we may ask, Where are now to be found the equals of Bacon, Shakspeare and Milton? Does the absence of such men prove

that the Anglo-Saxons have degenerated, that society has retrograded, or that our systems of education are worse now than in the age of Elizabeth or Charles? Men are apt without reflexion, to adopt this false standard of judgment. We sigh after such men as Edwards and Davies. Men of their generation were disposed to ask, Where are the Owens, the Howes, the Baxters and the Flavels of the age of the non-conformists? That age in its turn asked, where are the Luthers and Calvins, the Melancthons and Farel's of the Reformation period? And so on as long as men have been men. Homer was as contemptuous of the age in which he lived, as Dr. Spring can well be of the present generation. Though there is this strong disposition thus to magnify the past, to judge it by the standard of its extraordinary men, Dr. Spring is the first writer, so far as we know, who has ventured to attack important existing institutions, on the vague impression of the degeneracy of his contemporaries, without first taking the trouble to prove that as a body they are in fact degenerate.

If men are disposed to judge too favourably of the past, because of a few great men, they are no less prone to pass unjust judgment on the present, because of a few marked cases with which they happen to be familiar. Instead of denying the existence of such cases, let us honestly admit them; let us even allow them to be magnified and multiplied beyond the truth; but let us not consent that they shall be regarded as types and samples of the ministry at large. What if some of our young preachers are transcendental? What if some of them do make too much parade of learning, or affect a philosophical abstraction, quite destructive of all practical efficiency? What if some do babble about art and aesthetics, or write poetry for ladies' magazines or albums? This no more justifies a sweeping condemnation of the whole contemporary race, than a like condemnation of our fathers would be justified, by showing that in their days, there were ministers whose talk was of bullocks, who made better butter than sermons, or whose interest in the funds was greater than their interest in religion. There are always such exceptions in the best of times; at any one time they are apt to run in one mould. Great men and little men are alike apt to grow in clusters, or to shine in constellations. The succession of such follies is like that of diseases, certain though inexplicable. If the

foibles of our less successful candidates are just now rather poetical, artistical, and philosophical, than agricultural, financial, or political, the change is perhaps not so much for the worse as some may imagine. At all events, the new sort should not suffer disadvantage from the fact that the very nature of their weaknesses brings them more into public view, and more into contact with city congregations and the city clergy, than the weaker brethren of an earlier day, who hastened to withdraw themselves from public view in farms and stables, banks and brokers' offices. If the young men of the present day are more apt to be Pharisees, to make broad their phylacteries and to sound a trumpet before them, this only puts them at a disadvantage in comparison with those ministerial Publicans, of other times, who used to sit at the receipt of custom, unobserved and unmolested. In a word, the devious paths by which young preachers go astray, are not one but many, and it does not follow that because one is crowded now, that no other has been crowded before, or will ever be again. Still less does it follow that because some of our young men are conceited, all of them are worthless; that because some do not know what they are in the pulpit for, "the pulpit," as a general thing, "is less powerful than it was in the days of our fathers."

These suggestions are sufficient to show that the disposition to extenuate the present in comparison with the past, though natural, is not to be trusted. It is not confined to ministers in advanced life, nor is it restricted to the church; lawyers, doctors, merchants, statesmen, are all prone to indulge it. It was quite as often manifested in past ages as at present, and if we confide in its dictates, we must conclude that not the ministry alone, but all professions, and all departments of society, are beyond measure in a worse state now than they ever were before; because according to this view of matters, every age is worse than that which preceded it.

We are not content however with merely showing that Dr. Spring has assumed what he ought to have proved, and that his assumption is unauthorized, due to a disposition easily accounted for, but a most unsafe guide, we go further and maintain that every thing is against the fundamental doctrine of this whole chapter. It is confessedly difficult to compare the present with past ages. We know the one far better than we know the

others. We cannot get any satisfactory standard of comparison, or appeal to any competent and authoritative judge. Still all the evidence is against the assumption on which Dr. Spring has founded his argument. All probability is against it. Has not the country advanced, not only in population, but in agriculture, in commerce and the arts? Has not the general improvement and the intellectual progress of the people, been uninterrupted during the last fifty years? Has not education become more and more widely diffused, taking the country as a whole? Have not our schools, academies and colleges been greatly multiplied, and greatly elevated, so that those who graduated at some of our colleges thirty years ago, could hardly now be admitted to the lower classes of the institutions of which they are the alumni? Has not the demand of the people for superior cultivation and attainments in all public servants, greatly increased? and has not professional education made a corresponding progress? Have not medical science and medical training advanced? Has not, in short, the whole country been going forward in all the forms of life? If these questions must be answered affirmatively, and we know no one who would deliberately give a negative reply to any one of them, then it would be a most startling and unaccountable fact, if the ministry alone, in the midst of this universal progress, were either stationary or degenerated. We do not believe it. In the absence of all proof, and without even the pretence of argument in support of this deterioration, to take it for granted as a conceded fact, is as gross a sin against logic as was ever committed. How is it with the church? has the church been going backward for the last fifty years? On the contrary have not all denominations of Christians, our own among others, made astonishing progress during that period? Have not our churches been multiplied, our members, ministers, presbyteries, synods, increased beyond all example? The Presbyterians in this country have risen in that time from three synods to thirty embracing some three thousand ministers. They have now near four thousand churches, and more than three hundred thousand communicants. The contribution for religious purposes are not less than six hundred thousand dollars annually, in addition to the amount paid for the support of the ministry, building churches, and the numerous contributions not included in our

ecclesiastical statistics.* Since the disruption of our church in 1838, our own division, then little more than one half, is in all respects nearly equal to what the whole then was. This rapid extension of the church, this increase of her resources and efficiency, is not something merely outward; it is the manifestation of a corresponding increase of inward life. No one can doubt that there has been an elevation in the general standard of piety, liberality and efficiency, corresponding in a good degree, to this vast increase of numbers. Dr. Spring, we presume, will not assert, in the face of all this evidence of progress, that the church has really been going backward. And if he admits that the church has thus rapidly advanced and is still advancing, is he prepared to say that the ministry is deteriorated? Is he willing to maintain such a solecism as that a church may be prosperous in all that is good, increasing in numbers, in efficiency, in purity, in orthodoxy, and its ministry be getting worse and worse? This cannot be. He must either maintain that the church in this country is going down, decreasing in all that is good, or he must retract the reproach which he has cast on a whole generation of his brethren.

We appeal not only to this progress of the church in proof that the ministry is not deteriorated, but we ask whether there ever was a time when the ministry of the Presbyterian and of other churches stood higher, in public estimation, than they do at present? Do they not take their stand in the first rank of the educated men of the country? Are they not among the foremost in all works of literary, benevolent and religious enterprise? Is not their character for purity, sincerity and devotion as elevated as that of any body of ministers of equal number in the world? Is not the influence of the church which they represent and guide, far greater for all good purposes than it ever was before in any period of our history? Where is the rampant infidelity of the last generation—where are we to look for evidence that the kingdom of Satan is here pressing the church into a corner? It

* These statements are not meant to be precise, exactness for the purpose in view is not necessary. The statistics of our own part of the church, as given in 1847, include the following particulars—Synods 22, Presbyteries 118, Candidates 343, Ministers 1713, Churches 2376. Additions to the communion of the church, 13,274; whole number of communicants reported, 179,453; contributions for religious purposes \$310,164. Newly organized churches reported to the Board of Missions, 70.

is only a few months since one of the most influential high-church and tory organs of Great Britain, said it was a conceded fact, that Christianity had a more extensive influence, a deeper hold on the public mind in America, than in any other country in the world. We maintain that all these facts are utterly inconsistent with Dr. Spring's theory, and are a complete refutation of the whole argument of his twentieth chapter. If the church in this country is really thus increasingly influential, then it cannot be true that the ministry is degenerated.

We might appeal on this subject to other sources of proof. We might, if the thing were proper, take presbytery by presbytery through our church and compare the present members with their predecessors. In some individual cases the comparison might be favourable to the men of the last generation, but in the general, it would beyond doubt be the reverse. In looking around us we can hardly fix on a congregation whose present pastor is not decidedly in advance of his predecessor of the last generation, not only in scholarship, but in devotion to his work, and in efficiency. There is not a church which has not greatly increased in numbers and in liberality. In very many of them more is now given twice over for benevolent purposes than was formerly paid for salaries, while the pastor's support has been well nigh doubled. The average of scholarship, cultivation and efficiency has been greatly elevated. While thirty or forty years ago, we had a few eminent men, we have now a multitude of ministers of highly respectable talents and attainments. Acquisitions then rare, are now common. Where there was then one Hebrew scholar, there are now hundreds; where there was then here and there a well-read theologian, it is now rare to find a Presbyterian minister who is not a well educated man. We may take any other standard of comparison, and the result will be the same. We may refer to the records of the church for instances of ministerial delinquency, and see whether they are more or less numerous now than formerly. We may refer to the amount of labour performed; to the numbers brought into the church; to the efforts made for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom; to the band of domestic and foreign missionaries; to the self-denial and sufferings cheerfully or patiently endured by the younger ministers of this generation. Are these the men to be held up as a degenerate race? Are the mass of the present generation of ministers, who

are bearing the church onward with such wonderful success, and on whose labours God has looked with such marks of his favour, are they to be reproached as a generation of pigmies? We have no faith and little patience for such representations as those in which Dr. Spring has indulged, and on which he founds his argument. So far from the ministry having degenerated, the reverse is obviously the fact. As a class they have advanced in education, in devotion to their work, in their efficiency, and in their usefulness. We appeal to the progress and increasing influence of the church, as undeniable evidence of the truth of the assertion. The clergy, as a body, have now a higher character, and a better and a wider influence than the clergy of this country ever before attained. We do not ascribe this rapid increase of the church, and this improvement in the ministry to theological seminaries. That is not our argument. We are acting on the defensive. Dr. Spring says the ministry has degenerated, and therefore theological seminaries do harm. We say the ministry has not degenerated, it has vastly improved. If this is true, Dr. Spring's argument falls to the ground.

Here we might rest the matter. Dr. Spring's three propositions are, the ministry has degenerated; seminaries are the cause of this degeneracy; non-pastoral professors are the great cause of this evil influence of seminaries. If the first of these propositions is disposed of, as without any violent breach of modesty we may assume to be the fact, the others collapse of themselves. We feel, however, impelled to go on, and examine our author's mode of reasoning in their support.

Suppose that we admit that the ministry has deteriorated and the whole church degenerated since the institution of theological seminaries, does it thence follow that seminaries are the cause of these great evils? Is *post hoc ergo propter hoc* a logical mode of reasoning? We complain of Dr. Spring's argument as indiscriminating and unphilosophical. There have ever been periods of rising and falling in every church. The proximate causes of these changes are generally numerous, and often difficult to detect, and subtle in their operation. It is only for superficial declamation on a platform that it answers, to fix on some one fact and make it bear the whole responsibility. If we are to credit our anniversary orators, we must believe that the particular evil they assail, or the particular good they advocate, is the

cause of all the good or evil in the world. This mode of arguing does not suit a grave discussion, designed to lead to important practical results. The highly educated, orthodox, and spiritual clergy who accompanied the early settlers in New England, were gradually succeeded by a race of ministers lax in doctrine and worldly in spirit. After the times of Edwards, there was a gradual reaction and revival, until a new race of orthodox and devoted men appeared upon the stage. These changes took place under the same system of ministerial training. In Scotland, without any change in their system of theological education, the Melvilles and Hendersons were succeeded by the Moderates, and the Moderates again by the Chalmers, the Cunninghams and Candlishes of the present day. The men of the Free Church were trained under the very system which produced the lukewarm errorists of the preceding generation. So it was in France and in Geneva. The institutions founded by Calvin and which sent forth a succession of devoted pastors, without any change in their organization, produced their degenerate successors. The rationalists of Germany have been brought up on the same plan as that under which the strictly orthodox ministers of the seventeenth century were educated. What if some one, in the days of Scotch degeneracy, had argued as Dr. Spring does now. The ministry of this age are far inferior to their predecessors; therefore our system of ministerial training is all wrong. He might be met by another logician of the same class, at a later period, arguing that because the self-sacrificing and efficient ministers of the Free church were trained in the Scotch universities, that system must be the best in the world. Thus we should have the same system proved to be both good and bad. A mode of reasoning which leads to contradictory conclusions must be fallacious. If therefore the ministry of our generation were even as degenerate as Dr. Spring assumes it to be, it would not follow that seminaries are the cause of that degeneracy. There are other influences which bear on the character of the ministry, besides the mode of their theological training. It is not enough to show that the deterioration is subsequent to the institution of seminaries, to justify throwing the responsibility on them. Admitting then, for argument's sake, the deterioration of the ministry, which however we utterly deny, Dr. Spring has not made good his case against seminaries.

This is far from being the only logical sin to be found in the chapter under review. Dr. Spring gives the whole matter up. After having painfully erected his house of cards, he pushes it down with his own hand, that no one else may have the pleasure of seeing the catastrophe. A large part of the chapter before us is consumed, not merely in asserting, but in proving, that the change in the mode of ministerial education has a necessary tendency to weaken the "power of the pulpit." But near the close of his whole argument, the author, in a beautiful tribute to the senior professors of "our seminaries," speaks of them as having made and kept those seminaries what they are; he represents the evils which he had before described as still prospective and contingent on a time, "when the places they have so long occupied shall be occupied by men of no pastoral experience." (p. 391.) Seminaries then as yet have done no harm. The virus has not yet begun to operate, and the melancholy influence which had been described as exercised by seminaries, was so viewed only in prophetic vision, as the future consequence of changes which may be entirely prevented. If the bias of the system is still latent and inoperative after forty years of trial, may we not hope that it is imaginary, and that the deterioration of the ministry, if real, must be referred to some other cause? At any rate Dr. Spring cannot take both positions; seminaries have deteriorated the ministry; and pastoral professors have prevented the evil influence of those institutions. The latter of these assertions destroys the former.

There is in our author's argument on this subject no wide and manly view of the whole field; no comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the public and private systems of instruction. There is nothing but a one sided exhibition of the matter in discussion. Advantages common to both methods are set down as peculiar to one; all evils are clustered on one side, and all virtues on the other. Among the advantages ascribed to the old method of instruction are the following: that the young men were not only listeners but enquirers, and were encouraged to be disputants; that they took their turn in conducting worship; that they attended popular religious meetings; that they mingled in society, became acquainted with men and things, and acquired good manners. From this a stranger might be pardoned for inferring that at present, students are forbidden to ask questions, that their

disputatory propensities are carefully suppressed, that they are never called upon to lead the prayers of others; that they never attend prayer meetings or religious lectures; that they are rigidly excluded from society; and that all this is the natural result of the seminary system. Such a stranger might well wonder to be told that even in the largest classes students are permitted to ask questions, with an unrestricted right of interrogation in private; that many students spend even an undue proportion of their time in regular debates among themselves or in the presence of their teachers; that most of them habitually lead the devotions of their fellow students or of the families where they reside; that a multitude of sabbath schools, societies and lectures, have been maintained by them for more than thirty years; that they sometimes labour in revivals not only singly but jointly and for weeks together; that they have as free access to company as they would have in a pastor's house; and that the danger of excess, in this as well as other sources of enjoyment, is at least as great as that of abstinence or privation.

The truth is, Dr. Spring draws upon his own imagination. The real evils and dangers of seminaries he does not touch, while those which he ascribes to them, they who have better means of knowledge, see to be imaginary. He directs his battery against a figment of his own creation. We do not pretend to know what Andover may have been in the first years of its existence; but we certainly know of nothing now corresponding to the picture here presented. To those who are actually engaged in the course of study at any of our institutions, the light in which they are here presented must be almost ludicrous. Some of them will certainly be surprised to learn that the great evils of the system are monastic seclusion and excessive learning. It does not seem to have occurred to Dr. Spring as possible that foppery, idleness, frivolity, could ever gain an entrance into such a body, and that while he is solemnly deprecating an undue devotion to scholastic lore, the teachers to whose influence he thinks the evil owing, may be vainly striving to impart the elementary ideas of theology to some of these supposed recluses. He little imagines that while he is scared at the evils of scholasticism and the neglect of practical interests, a large part of the student's time in most of our seminaries is spent in the manœuvring of committees and societies, bearing directly on the great benevolent

enterprises of the day. We make no attempt to hide or palliate what we regard as evil tendencies, because we wish to show how perfectly unlike they are to those which exist in Dr. Spring's ideal seminary, and at the same time to illustrate the utter insufficiency of pastoral experience, however long and otherwise successful, to supply the knowledge of facts without the trouble of investigation.

In comparing the advantages of the two methods, Dr. Spring connects some things in the relation of cause and effect, which we should scarcely have expected to see joined together. He says, for example, that students of theology, under the old regime, were taught less than they are now, but studied more, thought more, wrote more, (p. 393.) Does he mean to say the first of these produced the others? Was it because "their minds were not so richly furnished," that "they were better disciplined"? Was it because they had "less learning and fewer attainments," that "they were abler men, abler casuists, abler polemics, abler, more instructive, and more practical and acceptable preachers of the gospel"? We do not now ask for the proof of this unqualified assertion; but we do ask for the philosophy of the fact, for some explanation of the nexus between any of these pairs of phrases, beyond Dr. Spring's affirmation that "the consequence was" so and so. Perhaps he will be gratified to learn that under the new system also, there are men whose minds are not richly furnished, who have little learning and few attainments, who hear few lectures and transcribe none at all, and who may therefore be expected to have minds better disciplined, to be abler men, abler casuists, abler polemics, abler, more instructive, and more practical and acceptable preachers of the gospel, than their more conscientious and "scholastic" brethren.

Another misapprehension under which our author appears to labour is, that the course of study is unbroken, a continuous imprisonment of three years in duration. Whereas the truth is that in all our seminaries the exercises are suspended for more than three months of the year, and that a large proportion of the students spend this interval in active labour, as teachers, colporteurs, missionary preachers to the boatmen on our waters, and in other destitute fields. The amount of time thus spent is constantly increasing, and even those who do not thus employ themselves, are usually visiting their friends and getting a glimpse of civilized

society before returning to their savage keepers, scholastic studies, and monastic cells.*

The want of pastoral supervision is lamented as another crying evil of the seminary system. It is obvious that so far as this evil exists it is the fault of the men who conduct the system, and not of the system itself. There is nothing to prevent such supervision, but every thing to favour it. We are very far from saying that our professors are as faithful in the discharge of this duty as they ought to be; nay, it is with them as with pastors, some have a much better gift for that particular service than others. Still we should risk little in saying that more confidential intercourse has often taken place between a single theological professor and his pupils in a single week, than takes place between some city pastors and their large congregations in a year.

Admitting the inconveniencies which more or less attend the present system of instruction, does that prove it to be worthless? Is there any method of improvement which involve no sacrifice of something good, at least for a time? Every hour of study carries with it the abandonment of some amusement. The boy sent from home to school or college loses for a time and frequently forever the advantage of domestic culture and parental discipline. But who proposes to abolish schools and colleges on that account? And yet because the theological student, during his course of study, cannot be at home, or in the parsonage, or in society, or any where else but at his book, the system is a bad one. With equal reason might a man refuse to take a sea voyage for his health, because he cannot ride on horseback or frequent public libraries on ship-board. The simple question is,

* In the address of Dr. Hopkins, delivered at the recent Anniversary of the Tract Society it is stated that "during the past year one hundred and six students connected with seventeen theological seminaries and colleges, had employed their vacation in colporteur labours among the destitute with a summary of results as follows: Whole number of families visited, 39,947; families conversed and prayed with, 21,461; number of volumes sold, 42,644; number of volumes distributed gratuitously in destitute households, 10,021, besides 712,000 pages of Tracts: number of prayer meetings held or public meetings addressed 931; number of families destitute of all religious books, 4,271; families of Roman Catholics or other errorists, 3,157; families destitute of the scriptures, 1,952, of whom 1,776 were supplied." This is only one of the societies in whose service such students find employment. Many are engaged in the service of the American Sunday School Union, the Bethel Society, and similar associations. The labour thus employed is very great, and the opportunity of culture in practical knowledge is by no means inconsiderable.

whether the voyage is necessary for his health. If so, the objections become puerilities. In like manner, if attendance on a seminary course is found to be the surest and most efficacious method of obtaining the necessary knowledge, to object that the man while there cannot be elsewhere, is as idle as it would be to object that sleeping hinders a man from eating, or that a servant sent upon an errand cannot at the same time be at work at home,

Closely connected with this fallacy is that of finding fault with seminaries, because they do not in addition to their main design do some thing else which is desirable, but which they are not intended to accomplish. Thus we are told that students, after passing through a seminary, ought to acquire practical experience with a pastor. Very good. This might be an excellent arrangement. We are no advocates for the premature entrance of young men on the work of the ministry; the more of all kinds of useful discipline and experience they can obtain the better. If those having the authority choose to adopt this plan, or to make the course longer and narrower, as in Scotland, by employing half the year in study and the other half in pastoral apprenticeship, the seminaries are the last quarter whence any objection would be heard. But until some such arrangement is effected, it is no more just to charge seminaries with not doing their own work first and something else afterwards, than it would be to blame colleges because they do not teach their undergraduates theology or law or medicine.

Another injustice of the same kind but more serious, is the attempt to throw on seminaries the responsibility of acts performed or not performed by presbyteries. The seminaries of the church according to their very constitution are without ecclesiastical authority. This feature of the plan was guarantied by the Assembly to the churches, as its records show. No Theological Faculty can take a single step towards the licensure or ordination of a student. The power of the Presbyteries, in this respect, is absolute, and their responsibility undivided. If they see fit to relax the rigour of their requisitions or the thoroughness of their examinations in the case of seminary students, let them see to it, and answer for it to the church and to themselves, but let them not attempt to justify their neglect by sharing their responsibility with others. Dr. Spring asserts, not only in

his own name, but in that of his whole presbytery, "that but for the fact that they have spent three years in pursuing their theological course, and but for the recommendation of their professors, not a few of them would have been refused their license to preach the gospel." (p. 388.) We doubt very much if a single instance has occurred, within the last ten years, in which the Presbytery of New York has been induced to license any man on either of the grounds here stated. What individual professors may have done, we know not; but we do know that the faculty of the Princeton Seminary, at least, gives no such recommendations. So far from its being the case that students are passed because they have completed a three years' course of study, they are almost always licensed long before its close, and sometimes in direct opposition to the wishes of their teachers. For a course of years the Princeton professors struggled hard against the practice of allowing undergraduates to be licensed; and now that they have been compelled to yield, it is certainly hard that they should be made to bear the blame of that which they so long strove vainly to prevent.

There is only one point more, in Dr. Spring's attack on Seminary education, as the cause of ministerial deterioration, which we think it worth while to notice. This is his strange idea, that the system is a new one and peculiar to America, a kind of rash experiment which has been going on among ourselves for less than half a century. What does he mean by Seminaries? If he means our schools of theology with all their minute details of organization and instruction, his arguments can only be applied to one, for no two are in these respects alike. If, on the other hand, he means the practice of assembling students of theology at one place, to pursue their studies under a distinct class of professors, then we do not understand his representing as a new experiment what has always existed in the Reformed churches since the Reformation. That he is not unaware of the historical fact, is clear from his allusions to the practice of the German, Genevese, and Scotch, as to their choice of professors. The only way in which we can account for this misrepresentation is by supposing that our author means to call the system new, in reference merely to the early practice of the American churches. But he might as well call cities an American invention, because none existed in our first colonial

settlements. This is not a mere error of expression; it affects the author's view of the whole question, by leading him to look upon the infant state of our colonial churches, during which the European modes of education, though desired, were unattainable, as a deliberate rejection of those modes. To this infant state he seems to wish we could return, although he reckons it, for reasons not by any means conclusive, now impossible. He might as well argue against General Assemblies as an unsuccessful American experiment, because we had none when our whole church was confined to the Philadelphia Presbytery. As soon as that presbytery reached the requisite dimensions, it divided and became a synod; and as soon as that synod became too unwieldy, it resolved itself into several, and constituted an Assembly, not as an American invention, but exactly on the old Presbyterian model. In like manner our enlightened fathers, when their grammar schools were no longer sufficient, established colleges, with a specific view to ministerial education; and when these no longer answered the enlarged wants and expectations of the age, professional seminaries were added to complete the system, not as a new invention, but in zealous emulation of all the Reformed churches in the old world, every one of which, so far as we know, has its theological faculty. To compare the state which we have reached with that at which we set out, is to argue that because we do not like the present fashion of men's clothes, we will return to those we wore in infancy. If any should insist upon this change, the rest would be apt to say as Voltaire said in answer to Rousseau's panegyric on a state of nature, that although he felt an irresistible desire to return to it he was now quite too old to think of going on all fours again.

This argument against seminaries is but a revival of the discussion about the comparative advantages of public and private education. If a boy could be thoroughly educated at home, it might be well to keep him there, but as this is impossible, colleges are deemed essential. Although there are evils incident to a public education, yet there are also evils connected with the private plan, so that even if the education it secured were equal to that obtained in a college, there still might be great doubt which should be preferred. But as it is evident that few parents or tutors can give a boy the advantages to be derived from a college with its corps of professors, its apparatus and libraries,

no one now hesitates to encounter for his child the dangers incident to a public education. It is the same with regard to seminaries. There are evils incident to a public professional education, and there are also many incidental advantages connected with it, such as the collision of minds, the formation of friendships, similarity of views, sympathy and mutual confidence, &c. &c. On the other hand there are advantages and disadvantages incident to the private method of theological training. It might be hard to strike the balance between these incidents of the two systems. The church, in adopting the Plan of the Seminaries at Princeton and in Allegheny, and giving the enumeration of the benefits to be expected from them, clearly expressed the conviction that even as to these incidental and subordinate matters, the advantage is on the side of the public method of education. But when we come to the main point, the professional training itself, there is an end of all competition. No one man engaged in the constant routine of pastoral duty, can be expected to do as much in the way of teaching as three or four men devoted exclusively to that work. You might as well expect a colonel of a regiment in the field to give a scientific education to his subordinate officers. He may be an abler man than any of the professors at West Point, but he has too much else to do, to be an efficient teacher. The whole question really is whether a thorough education for the ministry is desirable. The Assembly and the church have decided this question. They have said that the candidates for the ministry "must be familiar with the original languages of the Holy Scriptures;" that they must be skilled in the interpretation of the sacred text; that they must be versed in the antiquities of the church; well acquainted with the evidences of our faith; well disciplined in theology, didactic, polemic and casuistic; well instructed in ecclesiastical history, and in the true principles of the organization and government of the church. To attain this end, they decided, as all other Reformed churches in the old world had done before them, and as all enlightened churches in this country, have done either before or since, to establish theological seminaries. Those old enough to know any thing of the plan of pastoral instruction, deprecate the very thought of the church receding to that method. Men of extraordinary minds will work their way to eminence, under any sys-

tem; but for ordinary men it would be a ruinous change. The method formerly pursued was not uniform, different pastors having different plans. It was however very common for candidates to be licensed as soon as they left college, and then to put themselves under the direction of some minister. While under his care, they rode about the country "candidating," the minister correcting their sermons, and directing their reading, until they got a call. This would last some three, six or twelve months. The education of the ministers of the last generation was received in college. All that followed, with rare exceptions, was their own work, after they began to preach. The proposal to revert to the old method is therefore virtually a proposal to discard all professional education for the ministry.

Dr. Spring's argument against seminaries is only an echo of the argument commonly urged against our national military academy, and will be responded to by the same class of men. Our fathers, it is said, fought the battles of the revolution without a scientific education, and where are the men to compare with them? The war, now through the mercy of God just brought to a close, has taught, we hope, the country the lesson, that it is a useless sacrifice of blood and treasure to rely on undisciplined valour in the day of battle. It was the scientifically educated officers of the army who achieved the late victories in Mexico, which have few parallels in the history of modern warfare. It is of no account to object that experience can not be learned at West Point. Very true. That is not what men go there to learn. They go there to learn what renders experience rapidly attainable; to get the knowledge and training which enable men to turn everything to account in the hour of trial. It is no less vain to object that pastoral experience is not to be obtained in a theological seminary. That also is true. Such experience can be gained only in the pastoral office. But put a well educated and disciplined man into that office, and he will gain more experience in a year than a man without education would gain in a life time.

The real dangers and deficiencies of our seminaries have not been touched upon by Dr. Spring. They were not intended to give pastoral experience, but to give learning, to discipline the mind, to cultivate piety and the social affections, to bring a number of young men together to act upon each other, and to

become friends prepared to act heart and hand in the service of the Lord. The danger is not in the system but in the men. Everything depends, under God, on the professors. If they are not of the right kind, their influence on the students must be to the last degree injurious. If Dr. Spring had chosen to direct his battery to that quarter, he would have assailed the weak point; he would have found no disposition to resist; he would have awakened the consciousness of deficiencies and neglects, which must have stopped the mouths of most teachers at least; and he would, at the same time, have called the attention of the church to the real point to be guarded. No one can estimate too highly the importance of vigilance as to the character of the men entrusted with the work of training the future ministers of the church; and no one can be so well aware of their shortcomings as those who fill that office. We would honour Dr. Spring for every effort to arouse the church to a sense of its obligation as to the conduct of its seminaries, but we deprecate as unjust and injurious all attempts to shake, to no good purpose, the well considered confidence which the church has placed in the system itself.

We shall say very little on the third proposition which our author advocates, viz. that the evil influence of seminaries arises, in a great measure, from the practice of filling theological professorships with men who have no pastoral experience. We shall not do more, in reference to this point, than indicate some of the inaccuracies of fact and argument into which he has inadvertently fallen. He says, "It is a wise arrangement of the theological seminary of the Presbyterian church, that the professors shall be ordained ministers of the gospel." (p. 379.) This rule, in Dr. Spring's opinion, ought to be interpreted as meaning "stated pastors." But however interpreted, and however wise, no such rule exists. The only rule upon the subject is, that the Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology shall be an ordained minister. And even this, we are assured by one who took an active part in the founding of the seminary, was originally so framed as to admit the appointment of a layman, if ordained before his actual induction into office. We do not mention this as a desirable arrangement, but simply to show the nature of the premises from which our author sometimes argues, and how widely he differs from the fathers he so much vener-

ates. This mistake is the more surprising in one who has for several years presided in the Board of Directors, and is now providentially its highest officer, and who took an active part, within ten years, in the inauguration of a professor, who, at the time of his election was not even a licentiate, nor so much as a candidate for licensure, and who did not become an ordained minister until six months after he received his professional instructions from the lips of Dr. Spring himself.

Our author's argument from history is no less unfortunate. He admits the historical fact that some influential errorists "have been settled pastors before they became professors." His answer is, "They were men who were good men and true, and who became corrupt after they left the pastoral office; if these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" (p. 389.) It seems then the great safeguard on which he relies is insufficient. It is not enough for a professor to have pastoral experience, his only security is continuing to be a pastor. It happens, however, that almost all the great defections in seminaries have occurred in men who continued to be pastors while acting as professors. To hold these offices in plurality was the favourite plan of the Moderates in Scotland, which was opposed by the evangelical party, and has been repudiated by the Free Church. It was and still is the custom in Geneva, where Socinianism was gradually introduced and has so long reigned. It is a common arrangement in Germany itself, whence Dr. Spring would gather his most impressive warnings. The truth is, he is leaning upon a broken reed. This dependence on anything external, as a security for the soundness of the seminaries or of the church, is very short-sighted. Unless, by the grace of God, piety and truth are upheld in the ministry generally, no such external precautions are of any worth. Harvard did not apostatize until the pastors of Boston had departed from the faith. If God keeps the church pure, the seminaries cannot become corrupt. If the pastors continue faithful, the professors will be constrained humbly to follow their steps.

To enforce his doctrine of the absolute necessity that every professor should have been a pastor, our author draws a most forbidding picture of a professor without pastoral experience. Who sat for the portrait, or what may be the fidelity of the likeness, we do not presume to say. It has very much the appearance of a

fancy sketch. Things in nature are not all light or all shade. But Dr. Spring has painted the professor all darkness, and the pastor all light. It does not appear why every professor must be cold and dry, unacquainted with men, ignorant of the human heart, incapable of impressive, practical preaching; preferring learning to religion; whose sermons must be theological essays; whose commentaries, should he write any, must lack the right savour; whose reviews, and even whose experimental works, must want vitality. Has not our author mistaken the personal defects of some unfortunate professor, whom he had in his eye, for the essential characteristics of the whole class? One cannot see why a professor, by the grace of God, may not possess some warmth of heart; why he may not gather from intercourse with hundreds of educated youth some knowledge of human nature; why he may not have frequent intercourse with other men; why his daily exposition of the scriptures to a body of candidates for the ministry may not come as near to real preaching as much that is often heard from the pulpit. In our younger days, we have often listened to theological lectures, which we regarded as means of grace; and have heard, even from German lips, truly devotional expositions of the scriptures. Dr. Spring's view of the matter is very discouraging. Professors, we know, have been in the habit of regarding the evils he depicts, as personal faults, and not as inseparable from their office. And we suspect that if our author could only secure the appointment of truly humble, fervent men to our theological chairs, he would be rejoiced to find them infusing something of that savour into their instructions and sermons, which he seems to think belongs exclusively to pastors.

Dr. Spring is very confident of his position. He says the more the thing is considered the more obvious will "the absurdity" appear of putting men to train pastors, who have no pastoral experience. This assertion, to a certain class of minds, will no doubt appear decisive. It is, however, precisely on a par with the assertion that it is absurd to set men to train officers for the army, who have never seen a battle,—an absurdity practised with good effect by all the civilized nations of the world. It is found that men who never saw blood, can teach mathematics, engineering, gunnery and tactics; and our fathers were absurd enough to think that a man, who had not been a pastor,

might teach Hebrew, Exegesis, Theology or Church History. We do not undervalue pastoral experience. The more experience a man has of any kind the better; and there should be in all seminaries a professor of pastoral theology, to whom the widest experience in the pastoral life would be invaluable. Our author's whole difficulty arises from a confusion of thought as to what a theological seminary is, and is designed to accomplish. It is intended mainly and directly to impart the requisite knowledge for the work of the ministry; experience is to be acquired in the field.

The position which Dr. Spring assumes is in some respects a singular one. He admits that theological seminaries must be maintained, and yet the whole drift and design of his argument is to prove them to be an evil. He labours to show that as an experiment they have failed. We had a better ministry without them. The only proper conclusion from his argument is that seminaries should be abolished. That we have them; that money has been invested in their endowment; that public sentiment is in their favour; will convince no man that they ought to be continued. If what he says is sound, it is the obvious and imperative duty of the church, to abolish at once all such institutions and revert to the old method of ministerial training. It is very true the thing cannot stop there. The arguments which our author urges against seminaries are applicable, in the main, and with far greater force, not only against colleges, but against a learned ministry altogether. Dr. Spring is aware of this. He could not fail to see the real bearing of his argument, and hence his frequent protestations of zeal for a learned ministry. In these protestations he is doubtless sincere. If, however, a man, in this country, argues against colleges, and insists that boys ought to be taught the languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, mental and moral science, rhetoric, &c., by their parents, whatever his zeal for literature, he does in fact argue against a liberal education. If he argue against the military academy, he argues against a scientific education for the army. In like manner, an argument against theological seminaries, and in favour of each pastor teaching Hebrew, the exegesis of the Old and New Testament, theology in all its departments, church history, &c., &c., is an argument for an uneducated ministry. To be consistent, Dr. Spring must object

to candidates for the ministry being educated in colleges. Their training for the sacred office commences in the college. But there also they are secluded; there too they are deprived of the supervision of their pastors; there they are under scholastic influences and exposed to many sources of evil; there they can gain no pastoral experience, and get no insight into their future practical duties. They must therefore get their academical as well as their professional education from their pastors. It being an obvious impossibility that any pastor, no matter what his learning or his ability, can have the time to instruct theological students in those branches which the state of the church and of the world shows to be necessary, any proposal to throw this task on pastors is a proposal that the work should be left undone; and no amount of zeal for a learned ministry can save the advocate of such a proposition from the responsibility of opposing theological learning. The unavoidable result of the adoption of such a plan would be, that the mass of ministers would be ignorant men. Here and there a man of superior abilities and advantages would tower above the rest, and in the hands of this small class, all influence and authority would be concentrated. There is no surer way to exalt the few than by depressing the many. Our theological seminaries are the great levellers of the clergy. They secure a general equality of culture, and prevent this marked ascendancy and power of individuals. Dr. Spring feels that his argument goes too far. He knows that the enlightened judgment of the church is against him. He cannot be blind to the fact that if the Presbyterians were to lower their standard of theological education, they must resign their position in the country, give up to other denominations the service of God in resisting error and promoting truth, and be content to see all their youth of promise seeking elsewhere the knowledge their own church denied them. In a recent debate in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, on an overture to increase the number of their "Divinity Halls," Dr. Cunningham said, the real question was, "What is the right mode of providing an adequate and efficient theological education for the ministry of the Free Church of Scotland?" He urged that there should be a faculty of four professors, two of Didactic Theology, (including history), and two of Exegetical Theology, one for the Old Testament and one for the New. He-

brew is to be learned before entering on the proper theological course, which is to continue four years. In all this the Assembly sustained him. Compare this scheme with Dr. Spring's plan of pastoral instruction! Our author proves nothing or a vast deal too much. His book will furnish a welcome excuse for those who are desirous of an apology for refusing aid to our theological seminaries, and it will be the great authority for those who are opposed to all literary and professional education for the ministry. We run no risk in making this prediction. Unless we are misinformed, it has already been turned to both these accounts. To get rid of an unsightly branch, he has tried to fell the tree.

SHORT NOTICES.

ART. VII.—*Differences between Old and New School Presbyterians*, by Rev. Lewis Cheesman, with an Introductory Chapter by John C. Lord, D.D. Rochester: 1848.

With the author of this volume, we have no personal acquaintance; but from a perusal of the work, we have been led to the opinion, that he is not only a thoroughly orthodox man, according to the standard of the Presbyterian church, but also that he possesses a strong, discriminating mind, and has taken much pains to attain accurate knowledge on the subject on which he has written.

Some, no doubt, are of opinion, that the least said, on this subject, is best; but if ever a reconciliation between these two great sections of Presbyterians, shall take place, it will be in consequence of an impartial investigation of the points of difference between them; and by a return to sound doctrine by that party which has departed from the theology of the standards received in common by both parties. Discussion of doctrinal points, without acerbity, cannot but be useful at all times; but especially when undue excitement has subsided; and when many begin to inquire for the "old paths."

We are aware that there are those who think that there is no important diversity in doctrine between the parties; and that

the differences which exist are either trivial, or merely verbal. If such will give an impartial perusal to what is here clearly exhibited, they will be convinced, that on points of the greatest magnitude, the difference is radical. The systems of theology, held by the two parties, respectively, are widely diverse. But has our author fairly represented the sentiments of the New School? As far as the opinions of the distinguished writers quoted, are a true index of those of the body, it cannot be denied, that he has given a fair representation of their creed, for he has given their views in their own words.

But here, we are in danger of doing injustice to many worthy persons, who by accident, rather than choice are connected with the New School, and who are sincerely attached to the doctrines of our Confession and Catechisms. It is also known to us, that the division in some parts of our country, had no relation to doctrine, but altogether to church polity: dissatisfaction was produced by the proceedings of the General Assembly, in the years 1837 and 1838; and on this account, solely, many cast in their lot with those synods which were separated from the Presbyterian church.

We make this statement, that we may avoid the injustice of attributing to any opinions which they do not hold, and which perhaps they repudiate as sincerely as we do. We do not pretend to know what proportion of the New School ministers and members adopt the heterodox opinions of Beman, Barnes, Duffield, and such like, which our author has in this volume exhibited. We do hope and believe, however, that there are not only individual ministers, but whole presbyteries in that body, who reject these errors with abhorrence, and still adhere to the doctrines inculcated in the CONFESSION OF FAITH AND CATECHISMS, which still are their public standards, as much as ours.

If, however, the majority of the New School entertain the opinions of the authors above named, on original sin, the nature of sin, the nature of the atonement, regeneration, and the ability of man, it is a matter of surprise to us, that instead of vainly attempting to put a construction on the words of the Confession which will be conformable to their views, they do not draw up and publish A NEW CONFESSION, comprehending all the improvements which they suppose have been made in theology. This would be honest, and a regard to truth seems

to demand from them such a public confession of their faith, that all may have an opportunity of knowing what they do indeed believe. But this is their own concern not ours.

It may with some, create a prejudice against this book, that the author was once a zealous New School and New Measure man; but in our opinion this circumstance qualifies him to do more perfect justice to the subject, than one who had never been led astray from the truth. We have not observed any acrimony of style or bitterness of spirit in this composition. The author appears to us to be actuated by an honest zeal for the truth, and sincere desire to bring others to the knowledge of it. We feel free, therefore, without endorsing every sentiment, to recommend the book to all who wish for correct information on this subject.

A Discourse occasioned by the death of the Hon. Silas Wright, late Governor of the State of New York; and delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Albany, September 5, 1847. By William B. Sprague, D.D. 8vo. pp. 37. Albany: 1847.

This is a well devised and constructed discourse. The sentiments are excellent, and the illustrations appropriate, tasteful and happy. The author has contrived to pronounce the eulogy of a man pre-eminently devoted to his party, and to do it with great point and force, without encroaching on the delicate limits of party feeling. We have always been in the habit of regarding the late Governor Wright as one of the political nobles of our land; but his portrait, as drawn by Dr. Sprague, has served to raise not a little our estimate of his character.

A Sermon delivered at the Dedication of the South Congregational Church, in Durham, Connecticut. By Rev. William C. Fowler. 8vo. pp. 67. Amherst: 1848.

We take a special interest in dedication sermons, because they seldom fail to be connected with important historical information. In this discourse we have not been disappointed. From the pen of Professor Fowler we expected much; and our expectation has been answered. The author, rather unusually, founded his discourse on three different passages of scripture—two from the old, and one from the New Testament; and from these has severally deduced the three heads of his sermon. They are all appropriate, seasonable and instructive. Having disposed

of these with skill, he addresses himself to the historical sketch usually included in such discourses. This sketch is ample and satisfactory. The representation given of the fifty settlers of Durham is honourable to their character as men and as Christians, and leaves no room to wonder at the favourable course which their subsequent history presents. To the sermon is subjoined a large body of additional notes, which, though extended, are by no means tedious to those who take any interest in such inquiries. We cannot help repeating a wish which we have often expressed before, that every pastor could be induced to collect and publish as minute a history of his own church as we here find exemplified. The value of such minor histories, and of all reasonable minuteness in forming them, can be adequately appreciated only by those who, in the work of the larger historian, have been stopped, and perplexed, and mortified at every step in feeling utterly at a loss for a date, or a name, or an explanation, in consequence of which darkness must forever rest on multitudes of important spots in the history even of this youthful country.

The Stone of Help; a Discourse, Historical and Commemorative. Delivered to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, New York, on Sabbath evening, December 26, 1847, being the 50th anniversary of their organization. By John Niel McLeod, D.D., Pastor. Published at their request. Svo. pp. 24. New York: 1848.

This discourse is throughout historical. There is no doctrinal discussion, drawn from the text, prefixed, as is usually the case, on similar occasions. We mention this, not as a blemish, but rather as a commendable departure from the beaten path.

The fortunes of the "Reformed Presbyterian Church" in the United States, during the fifty years of its course, have been marked with much diversity and much interest. This body is small; but small as it is, it is divided, and, on account of its distinctive principles, is never likely to be very large. Yet the zeal, the sacrifices, and the energy of some of its ministers and other members have been truly remarkable, and do them lasting honour. Perhaps, indeed, no section of the great Presbyterian family, since the days of Cargill and of Renwick, in proportion to its numbers, has suffered more, or presented a larger list of men endowed

with the spirit of devotion, and even of martyrdom, than that to which Dr. McLeod belongs. He has exhibited their character and course in a manner which does to his talents, zeal, and Christian spirit, no small honour.

Apostolic Confirmation : or Reasons for discarding Episcopal Confirmation with laying on of hands. With an Appendix, setting forth John Calvin's real views of this ceremony. By Rev. James M. Allen. Richmond : 1848. pp. 76. 8vo.

The tendency in human nature in all ages, is to lay an undue stress on external ceremonies : and when any rite is sanctioned by ancient usage, an unreasonable importance is apt to be attributed to it, and its advocates leave no stone unturned to find some semblance of proof from scripture. CONFIRMATION, in the Roman Catholic church, is reckoned a sacrament ; in the Protestant Episcopal church it is received, not as a sacrament, but as an apostolical rite, which ought not to be neglected by Christians. The administration of this ceremony is one of the prerogatives of the episcopal office : no other hands are capable of conferring the blessing supposed to be communicated by this ancient rite. But, although confirmation is not by Episcopals called a sacrament ; yet it seems to us, that they attribute an efficacy and importance to it, which places it on an equality with any sacrament ; and this disposition to exalt the rite of confirmation is not peculiar to those called high-churchmen, but the most evangelical ministers of that communion are found among its most zealous advocates. If nothing else were meant by laying hands on the heads of such as have been baptized, when they have come to years of discretion, than a solemn imprecation of the divine blessing, and a public recognition of their connexion with the church by their own consent, we should not be disposed to find much fault with the ceremony ; for some such formal recognition of baptismal vows has been deemed proper by most of the reformed churches ; and this is all that Calvin favoured, whose authority has so often been pleaded in favour of this rite. But according to this view of the subject, the hands of a bishop are not requisite. The idea now entertained of confirmation however, is, that by means of this rite, administered by the bishop, the grace of the Holy Spirit is communicated, or rather increased. Now it is in this view, that

Presbyterians feel themselves bound to oppose this rite as unscriptural and dangerous. Mr. Allen, in the pamphlet here noticed, has entered fully into the subject, and has manifested a gratifying acquaintance with the writings of the Christian Fathers, as well as a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, so far as this subject is concerned. We have not seen anything on the subject of confirmation, which appears to us more satisfactory than this pamphlet; and especially, that part which relates to Calvin, sets the whole matter in a clear light. In our opinion, the Episcopalians made an egregious mistake when they transferred the controversy respecting the superiority of bishops to presbyters and also the obligation to observe the rite of confirmation, from tradition to the Holy Scriptures. For on this ground, their pretended proofs on both the points mentioned, possess scarcely the shadow of probability.

We are of opinion, therefore, that it would be good policy in them, not to appeal at all to the Scriptures, but to argue from the universality of the prevalence of their opinions in very early times. But on the same ground the Romanists can raise a defence of many of their superstitious ceremonies as plausible as that set up for confirmation, as an apostolic rite, obligatory on all Christians.

While we lament the necessity of spending time on such controversies, it gives us pleasure to find a writer so capable of doing justice to the subject as Mr. Allen; who though desirous of peace and fraternal intercourse with evangelical Episcopalians, has been led reluctantly to engage in opposing an unscriptural practice, and in defending Presbyterian principles.

A Catechism on the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church. 2d American Edition. By Rev. Alexr. Blakie. Boston. 1848. pp. 32.

This little manual was originally compiled by members of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland and exhibits within a small compass the scriptural reasons for the distinctive features of Presbyterianism. We commend it to general circulation, believing that there are many persons ready to read a little tract of this kind who would be repelled by a larger work from examining the subject.

Now it is to be increased rather than decreased

Practical Physiology for the use of Schools and Families. By Edward Jarvis, M. D. Philadelphia : Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co. 1848.

It is surprising that among all the subjects embraced in common school education, one so full of curious interest and practical value, as the structure and functions of the human body, should have been so long in finding a place. Even in the higher range of educational provisions furnished in our academies and colleges, this subject has seldom been embraced, except in an incidental way, for the purpose of illustrating the argument of Natural Theology; and in that case, it rarely goes beyond the very incomplete and often superseded teachings of Dr. Paley. Probably a principal reason of this exclusion is, that anatomy and physiology form a part of the proper professional training of the physician, and are therefore regarded as belonging exclusively to his domain. It is true that such a knowledge of these topics as would qualify a man for grappling with the phenomena of disease, would require a far more minute and extended study than could be embraced either in our primary or higher institutions; and it would be absurd to think of supplanting or interfering with any part of the training now required as a preparation for the Medical Profession. But every one must be aware that conceptions of the forms, position, character and functions of the human organs, which are not only inadequate and erroneous in the highest degree, but which often lead to ludicrous, and sometimes dangerous and fatal mistakes, are exceedingly common; and no one can doubt the desirableness of correcting these errors. And besides, a very small amount of knowledge, of the most elementary kind, would often prevent mischief, and sometimes save life. For instance, we have ourselves known not less than five cases, in which death resulted from a puncture of the femoral artery, where a child of ten years old, with the knowledge which such a child could easily acquire, might have prescribed a treatment abundantly sufficient to prevent a fatal result, until surgical aid could be procured.

And besides these utilitarian results of the study in question, it is fraught with interest and curiosity which strongly recommend it as a means of mental development and discipline; while in the hands of a truly religious teacher, it opens constant occa-

sion for the illustration and inculcation of religious truth, in methods at once natural, agreeable, striking, and impressive.

On every account we are glad to see a series of attempts to simplify the interesting and wonderful results of the application of modern science and research, in the departments of anatomy and physiology; and to render them sufficiently elementary, to serve as a part of the non-professional education of all our youth.

This book of Dr. Jarvis is the latest, and we think, the best we have seen, for the purpose just referred to. It is intended mainly for a school book, but it is so comprehensive, so full of information, and withal so intelligible and satisfactory in its execution, that few, except professional readers, would fail to be instructed and profited by its study. The practical bearings of the book upon the intricate questions of dietetics and general hygiene, seem to be generally judicious, and free alike from empirical and professional dogmatism; and its *morale*, so far as we have observed, is unexceptionable, though we could have wished it to be more pervading and effective.

An Earnest Ministry the want of our Times. By John Angell James. With an introduction by the Rev. J. B. Condit, D.D. of Newark, New Jersey. New York: W. M. Dodd. pp. 288.

The Ministry and the Spirit are the great and crowning gifts of Christ to his church. The first was instituted before his crucifixion, and was commissioned, previous to his ascension, to preach the gospel to every creature; the second was granted at the feast of Pentecost, when in the fulfilment of a previous promise, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the house where they were sitting; and there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." These ministers of Christ, thus "filled with the Holy Ghost," went out amid the multitudes that crowded Jerusalem, from the countries around the Mediterranean, to keep this solemn feast, and preach to them in their own language the wonderful works of God. The effect was electric. In full view of all the dangers to which dissent from the order established at Jerusalem would subject them, thousands believed, and were baptised, and were "added to the church." And this is the great, the divinely

appointed agency for the conversion of the world—a *Ministry filled with the Holy Ghost*. This in the language of the delightful volume before us, is an “earnest ministry,” to which every thing else in the way of means and instrumentalities should be both subordinate and subservient.

Hence, the exceeding importance of the subject discussed in the volume before us, and by one of the most earnest, and eloquent, and successful, ministers of our own age, whose name is no less familiar in America than in the island which his piety and genius adorn; a volume, so well introduced to the American reader by one of the most devoted and successful ministers of our own state. An estimate may be made of the matter of the book by the subjects of its various chapters which are as follows: “The Apostolic Ministry”—“The Nature of Earnestness”—“Earnestness exemplified in the matter and manner of preaching”—“Earnestness in reference to manner”—“Specimens of Earnestness from various authors”—“Earnestness as manifested in the delivery of sermons”—“Earnestness manifested in the pastorate”—“Examples of Earnestness”—“Motives to Earnestness”—“Means to be used for obtaining an earnest Ministry”—“The necessity of divine influence for an efficient Ministry.” And these topics are discussed with all that freshness, and unction, and eloquence, and power of illustration, and directness, which characterise the previous works of the author. In reading the book we marked many passages for quotation that our readers might have a specimen of its matter and manner; but on looking over it, we find we have pencilled nearly one half its pages. And as no quotation would give a true idea of its merits, we make none; but would most earnestly recommend it to the serious and prayerful perusal of all ministers, of all candidates for the ministry, and especially to all those who have any thing to do in the selecting or in the instruction of those who are to be the future pastors of our churches.

Religion Teaching by Example. By Richard W. Dickinson, D.D. New York: R. Carter. 1848. pp. 456. 12mo.

“As profane history has been defined, Philosophy teaching by example; so may sacred history be viewed as Religion teaching by example; hence the title of this volume.” In these prefatory words, the author has given an account of his work. It is a suc-

cessful attempt to hold out the events of biblical narrative as conveying divine truth. In doing this he pursues a plan of his own, and impresses his characteristics on every article of the series. Dr. Dickinson is a scholar, of much reading, reflection and refinement. These appear in his discussions, which constantly remind us by unobtrusive indications, of that varied and mellowing influence produced by classical pursuits and by philosophy. The natural tendency of the author's mind is obviously towards metaphysical inquiry; this being met and chastened by the narrative quality of his subject, results, we think, in a felicitous medium, of thoughtful narrative, modified by agreeable disquisition. It must be owned, that the book is without those purple and flaunting insignia, which now invite to books as really as to shows; it will in the same degree command abiding respect. The selection of topics is good. His treatment of them is judicious, and is altogether unlike that of Hall, or any writer of the kind, except in their generic agreement. We are thankful to Dr. D. for having, in more places than one, lent his aid to explode the mercenary tenet of those American moralists, who make all virtue consist in tendency to happiness. And we see in the whole production a promise of usefulness, in awakening ungodly minds, and elevating the contemplations of Christians; such as ought to cheer the author, now that he is withheld from the ordinary modes of fulfilling a ministry which he loves. Every year sees scores of religious books brought from Great Britain and widely circulated among us, which have nothing like the solidity or the elegance of this volume.

The Life, Letters and Remains of the Rev. Robert Pollok, A. M., author of "The Course of Time," and "Tales of the Covenanters." By James Scott, D.D., Pastor of the First R. D. Church, Newark, N. J. New York: Robert Carter. 1848. pp. 362. 12mo.

The ardent admiration of his subject, which the author manifests in every page, affords the true reason, we suppose, both for the length of the narrative and the warm tone of the language. It is a tribute to the memory of a favourite Scottish poet, which great numbers will consider just. Dr. Scott's mode of treating a subject is his own, and owes its characteristics to fertility of imagination and ardour of feeling; he therefore indulges

occasionally in forms of diction, which to critics of another temperament must appear extravagant. Even they, however, will not fail to recognize the earnestness and the piety which belong to the author. So far as we know, this is the only American memoir of Pollok. His brother published a sketch of his life, about five years ago, in Scotland. Dr. Scott has incorporated in the present volume, all that was valuable in the other.

Letters from Italy, by J. T. Headley. New and revised edition. The Alps and the Rhine ; a series of sketches, by J. T. Headley. New and revised edition. Baker and Scribner, New York. 12mo. 1848.

It was as a traveller that Mr. Headley first attracted our attention, and it is in this character that he still appears to us to excel. The lands here described are among the most interesting in the world, and they are spread before us with a freedom and liveliness which render this volume highly valuable and entertaining.

The Planetary and Stellar Worlds ; a popular exposition of the great discoveries and theories of Modern Astronomy. In a series of ten lectures. By O. M. Mitchell, A. M., Director of the Cincinnati Observatory. New York, Baker & Scribner, 36 Park Row. 1848. 12mo. pp. 336.

The eloquent lectures of Professor Mitchell have tended to make his favourite science popular among classes who would otherwise have remained in darkness. They were originally prepared and delivered in aid of a bold plan for erecting and furnishing an Observatory in Cincinnati. The great telescope, to obtain which Professor Mitchell went to Europe, arrived in Cincinnati, in 1845. The work here resulting from the Professor's labours, contains seventeen views of remarkable nebulae.

The Life of Oliver Cromwell. By J. T. Headley. New York, Baker & Scribner. 1848. 12mo. pp. 446.

Mr. Headley has here presented us with a most vivid picture of the Commonwealth and its heroes. Of Cromwell he thinks and writes with an enthusiasm which we sometimes think extreme. One effect is, however, unquestionably produced by his

earnestness; he is never dull. In our own day Carlyle led the way; he was followed by Merle; Headley has closed the series. No one of the books will have more readers in America. The author's vehement hatred of tyranny occasionally breaks out in declarations which outstrip our belief; but we nevertheless admire the portrait which he gives of one of the greatest commanders and rulers whom the world has seen.

The Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland. Sketches of their character and specimens of their eloquence. By Rev. Robert Turnbull. New York. 1848. 12mo. pp. 341.

Mr. Turnbull, as we are informed, is a native of Scotland, at present residing at Hartford, as a Baptist minister. He is a neat and pleasing writer, and has produced a volume which is singularly interesting, and of which the material is no where else accessible to English readers. His selection of specimens and his estimate of the authors are in almost every case felicitous. The discourses of Monod and Vinet are worth the price of the volume. Such models cannot but be useful to our cold and buckram sermonizers.

Lays of Love and Faith. With other fugitive Poems. By Geo. W. Bethune. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 8vo. pp. 184.

The friends of Dr. Bethune have long known that he indulged in verse; the present volume is a collection of numerous scattered pieces. They are equally remarkable for correctness and flow; indeed we have scarcely met with greater facility. There are several short effusions of great tenderness. The volume is produced in a style of luxurious elegance.

The British Female Poets. By Geo. W. Bethune. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1848. 8vo. pp. 490.

If selections are to be made, it is highly important that they should be made by persons of erudition and taste. Here are nearly sixty female authors of England, with biographies and characteristic sketches. To several of these we owe ourselves to have been introduced for the first time by this volume. The body of biographical and bibliographical notices is valuable. The selections are for the most part characteristic and happy. No

reader need regret the company into which he here falls; and every one may be made better by such strains as those of Hemans and Barrett. The observations on principles of taste and composition evince a ripe judgment and delicate sensibility. The typography is very beautiful.

Lectures on Shakspeare. By H. R. Hudson. In two volumes. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1848.

Often differing from Mr. Hudson, we nevertheless feel, at every page, that he is no common thinker. If he sometimes burns incense before his idol longer than we approve, it is always fragrant. What chiefly strikes us is that the author does not, like most, represent the present age. If he is extravagant, it is not with the vulgar. His very style breathes the spirit of old English thought and idiom. In his strange and vehement passages there is always something noble. He goes out of his way to have an occasional fling at the Puritans, but it does injustice to the general temper of his work. We thank him heartily for his mortal thrusts into the vitals of the modern ethics; and we generally agree with his principles of criticism.

The Life of Rowland Hill, A.M. By the Rev. Edwin Sidney, A.M. New York: R. Carter. 1848. pp. 412.

This work has been before the public more than fourteen years. We long since expressed our judgment of it at some length, and have only to renew our expression of warm approval.

Letters to Sabbath School Children. By the late Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, of the Ningpo Mission, China. New York: R. Carter. 1848. 18mo. pp. 71.

This little Sunday school book derives peculiar interest from the lamented death of its excellent author, of which an account is very properly annexed. The volume will be found to contain most important information, not only for children but adults; for Mr. Lowrie was a man of no ordinary powers and attainments.

The Life of Martin Boos, a Roman Catholic Clergyman in Germany. American S. S. Union. pp. 192.

No Christian reader will go through this book without surprise, delight, and edification.

A Token for Children; being an exact account of the Conversion, holy lives, and joyful deaths of several young children. By Rev. James Janeway. New York: R. Carter. 1848.

The *Token for Children* was known in every Presbyterian family, of the olden time. Age has rendered some of the expressions obsolete, but has not removed the holy earnestness which engaged and awakened our childhood.

The Listener. By Caroline Fry. From the Seventeenth London Edition. Two volumes in one. New York: R. Carter. 12mo. pp. 269.

The extraordinary popularity of this Christian lady's writings renders it unnecessary for us to add the applause which they deserve.

Presbyterianism, the Revolution, the Declaration, and the Constitution. By Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D. *The Character of the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D. LL.D., and the Lessons of his Life, from Personal Recollections*. By the Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D. Charleston. 1848.

Both these discourses are marked by Dr. Smyth's characteristic diligence and zeal for the testimony of our Church. The account of Dr. Chalmers contains a collection of valuable facts, which, so far as we know, are not to be found elsewhere.

The Noblest Freedom; or the Influence of Christianity upon Civil Liberty; a Discourse addressed to the Alumni of Jefferson College, Pa., by Robert Baird, N. Y.

A sensible and conservative discourse, on a subject which is second to none, in its national importance.

An Address delivered at the opening of the Hall of the Newark Library Association. By Samuel Irenaeus Prime. Newark. 1848. pp. 46.

Mr. Prime has here chosen a pleasing occasion, in the town where he resides, to utter a series of interesting and valuable suggestions. The whole is marked by the usual ease and sprightliness of the author.

Atheism and Pantheism; a Lecture delivered before the Young Men's Association for Mental Improvement, in the city of Albany. By Charles Murray Navine, M. A., Professor of Mathematics in the Albany Female Academy. Albany. 8vo. pp. 54.

We should be unjust to the cause of truth itself, if we failed to avow our judgment, that the author of this tract has conferred a public benefit by his observations on that atheistic philosophy, which is stealthily advancing upon us. The author evinces learning, logic, and wit, and especially a close acquaintance with the subject which he treats.

True Courage.—The Boy and the Birds.—The Two Paths.

Such are the titles of several new Sunday school books, which we have looked over with pleasure; but on which we cannot, at this late hour, make farther observations.

